1	REPORTER'S RECORD
2	VOLUME 1 OF 1 VOLUME TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. 2011-76724
3	
4	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS, * IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
5	<pre>Plaintiff, and THE STATE OF * TEXAS, acting by and through * The TEXAS COMMISSION ON *</pre>
6	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, a *
7	Necessary and indispensable * Party *
8	v. * HARRIS COUNTY, T E X A S
9	INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY, * MCGINNES INDUSTRIAL *
10	MAINTENANCE CORPORATION, * WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC., AND *
11	WASTE MANAGEMENT OF TEXAS, * INC., Defendants. * 295TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
12	TNO., Defendants. 293111 SUDICIAL DISTRICT
13	REPORTER'S RECORD
14	
15	DAILY COPY
16	NOVEMBER 13, 2014
17	
18	On the 13th day of November, 2014, the trial came
19	on to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the
20	Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, Texas:
21	Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype
22	machine; Reporter's Record produced by computer-assisted transcription.
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF, HARRIS COUNTY:
4	CONNELLY BAKER WOTRING, LLP
5	700 JPMORGAN CHASE TOWER  600 TRAVIS STREET
6	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.980.1713
7	BY: MR. EARNEST W. WOTRING
8	MS. DEBRA TSUCHIYAMA BAKER  MR. DAVID GEORGE  MR. JOHN MUIR
10	- AND -
11	THE OFFICE OF VINCE RYAN
12	COUNTY ATTORNEY 1019 CONGRESS, 15TH FLOOR
13	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.755.7880
14	BY: MR. ROCK OWENS FIRST ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY
15	TIRST ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNET
16	
17	COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF, THE STATE OF TEXAS:
18	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION
19	P.O. BOX 12548, CAPITOL STATION AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2548
20	PHONE: 512-463.2012
21	BY: MS. MARY E. SMITH MR. ANTHONY W. BENEDICT
22	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	
4	COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT, WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.
5	AND WASTE MANAGEMENT OF TEXAS, INC.:
6	GIBBS & BRUNS, LLP  1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 5300
7	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.650.8805
8	BY: MR. BARRETT H. REASONER MR. ROBIN GIBBS
9	MR. MARK GIUGLIANO
10	MR. ANTHONY KAIM MS. SYDNEY BALLESTEROS MR. COLIN POGGE
11	MR. BRIAN T. ROSS
12	
13	
13 14	COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT, INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY:
	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
14	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
14 15	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000
14 15 16	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD
14 15 16 17	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000 BY: MR. WINN CARTER
14 15 16 17	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES
14 15 16 17 18	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
14 15 16 17 18 19	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306 PHONE: 202.955.8500
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306 PHONE: 202.955.8500

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	COUNCEL FOR REFERENCE
4	COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT, MCGINNES INDUSTRIAL MAINTENANCE CORP.:
5	
6	WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP 1111 LOUISIANA STREET, 25TH FLOOR HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002-5242
7	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002-5242 PHONE: 713.651.2663
8	BY: MS. PAULA W. HINTON
9	MS. MELANIE GRAY
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
-	

## **NOVEMBER 13, 2014**

THE COURT: We are ready to go on the record.

Mr. Reasoner.

MR. REASONER: Yes, Your Honor. Barrett Reasoner for Waste Management of Texas.

reached a settlement with the Plaintiffs. The terms at this very moment are going to be kept confidential; but we would like to jointly move at this time to sever the claims against Waste Management of Texas, MIMC, and Waste Management of Texas, Inc. -- I'm sorry, Waste Management, Inc., into a separate cause number, the same cause number with an A added behind it, so that once the statutory notice process that the State needs to go through is complete, we can approach the Court with an agreed final judgment and ask that that be entered by this Court.

THE COURT: That is fine. The Court will -- grants that motion to sever. I think we should also make sure to include GC Environmental in that severance, even though they're not technically a party because they go along with these parties that have resolved their matter.

```
MR. REASONER: That is our intention and
1
   request, Your Honor, yes.
2
3
                 MR. WOTRING:
                               Harris County agrees.
                 MR. BENEDICT:
                                TCEQ agrees.
4
                 THE COURT:
                             Anything else we need to put on
5
   the record at this time?
6
7
                 MS. HINTON:
                              No.
                                   MIMC joins in that
8
   motion, as well, Your Honor.
9
                 MR. GEORGE: Can we go off a half second?
10
                 THE COURT:
                             Yes.
11
                 (Whereupon, after a discussion off the
12
   record, the following proceedings were had:)
                 THE COURT: Let's go back on the record.
13
                                                            Ι
   also understand that in light of this settlement, the
14
15
   parties have reached an agreement on a stipulation for
16
   the Court to read to the jury prior to reading them the
17
   Charge.
18
                 MR. GEORGE: Yes, Your Honor.
                                                 Harris
19
   County and TCEQ and International Paper, the remaining
20
   parties, have agreed to the following stipulation to be
21
   read to the jury. And I will read it, and then if
22
   everyone -- if International Paper and TCEQ could state
23
   their agreement and then the Court has a paper copy.
24
                 The stipulation is as follows: "Harris
25
   County and TCEQ have reached a settlement with Waste
```

```
Management of Texas, MIMC, and GC Environmental
1
2
   regarding the claims in this case. Therefore, those
3
   Defendants will no longer be part of this trial.
   Champion Paper and International Paper remain Defendants
4
   in this trial. The fact of this settlement does not
5
   affect any evidence you have heard and shall have no
6
7
   bearing on the issues you will decide. You should
8
   consider all the evidence you have heard during this
   trial in determining which, if any, party is liable
10
   under any statute. Because Waste Management of Texas,
11
   MIMC, and GC Environmental have settled, issues related
12
   to the Texas Spill Act are no longer part of this
   trial." And that concludes the stipulation.
13
14
                             Is that the stipulation as
                 THE COURT:
15
   agreed?
16
                 MR. BENEDICT: It is, Your Honor.
                 MR. STANFIELD: Your Honor, yes, it is.
17
18
                 MR. GEORGE: Nothing further.
19
                 THE COURT: We can go off the record.
20
                 (Whereupon, after a discussion off the
21
   record, the jury entered the courtroom and the following
22
   proceedings were had:)
23
                             Please be seated.
                 THE COURT:
24
                 Ladies and gentlemen, before I read you the
25
   Charge, I'm going to read an agreed stipulation
```

regarding settlement for you.

1

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Harris County and TCEQ have reached a 2 3 settlement with Waste Management of Texas, MIMC, and GC Environmental regarding the claims in this case. 4 Therefore, those Defendants will no longer be part of 5 this trial. Champion Paper and International Paper 6 7 remain Defendants in this trial. The fact of this 8 settlement does not affect any evidence you've heard and shall have no bearing on the issues you will decide. You should consider all the evidence you have heard 10 11 during this trial in determining which, if any, party is 12 liable under any statute. Because Waste Management of 13 Texas, MIMC, and GC Environmental have settled, issues 14 related to the Texas Spill Act are no longer part of this trial." 15

At this time I'm going to read through the Charge with you, ask you if you have any questions, and then we will proceed with closing arguments.

(Whereupon, after the Court's Charge was read to the jury, the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Do you understand these instructions? If you do not, please tell me now. And you will see the next few pages are the verdict certificate that we already discussed and then Exhibit A with the photograph that we also discussed.

Does anybody have any questions about the 1 2 Charge? 3 All right. If no one has any questions, we will proceed with --4 5 MR. GEORGE: Your Honor, if we could just approach for one minute. 6 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 (After a bench discussion outside the 9 hearing of the reporter and jury, the following 10 proceedings were had:) 11 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I do need 12 to correct one thing. I'm going to make the change on 13 this Charge, so that the official one you have is 14 correct. On Question 12, it should read: "On which 15 dates were the violations that form the basis of your 16 answer to Question 4" -- right? 17 18 MR. GEORGE: Question 4. 19 THE COURT: -- "Question 4 caused solely by 20 acts or omissions of a third person," not Question 8. So I'll fix both of those items for the official Charge. 21 22 And then lastly, I meant to make an announcement at the beginning that in order to 23 24 accommodate everyone who wants to be able to listen to 25 the closing argument, what we've done is -- all the

seats, it appears now, are filled. We can't have people standing in the aisles or at the doors. So if we have any people who don't have a seat, you're welcome to go down to the 333rd that's at the end of the hall where we are piping in the closing arguments so that everyone will have an opportunity to listen.

With that, we may proceed with closing argument.

Mr. Wotring.

MR. WOTRING: Thank you, Your Honor.

## **CLOSING ARGUMENT**

## BY MR. WOTRING:

Good morning. It seems like only yesterday; but, in fact, it was about a month ago was the last time I actually turned and addressed you. It dawned on me a couple of days ago that you've been looking at my left ear the last few weeks.

This will be the next to the last time I get to talk to you. The final time is after the Defendants do their closing and then I get to do a rebuttal. So I'm going to talk about the evidence we've heard in this case. Some of it may be repetitious, but it's been some period of time since you've heard of it. I'm going to try not to use one minute more of your time than is required.

But in this case, as in all cases, it's important to the parties who have brought it. This case, I think, is a little bit different because of the issues involved and the scope of those issues and the effect that the verdict in this case might have upon the conduct of others.

I don't think that it is an overstatement to say in this case that the decisions made in this case are important to how pollution will be handled in this county, how pollution will be handled in this state, and how pollution will be handled in this country. There are people who are getting together and deliberating all over, federal regulatory agencies, state regulatory agencies, about pollution, how we address pollution, and how we control pollution.

I think one of the most important deliberations that's going to go on in this country is the deliberation that is going to go on today after we conclude our argument, and that is the introduction to why I think it's appropriate to take up some more of your time to review the evidence that we've heard in this case, because I do think that the decisions that are made in this courtroom and announced in this courtroom will have momentous effects on how pollution is handled in our country.

That's one introductory comment I want to make. The other one is, Harris County is not, Connelly Baker is not, Ernest Wotring is not anti-business or anti-corporation. Harris County is filled with corporations that are responsible and do the right thing. Harris County is filled with people who work for corporations that do the right thing and are responsible.

This is a case in which we think it is about a company that did not follow its obligations under the law; and as a result, it should pay a penalty, as required by the law. The law says that if you cause, suffer, allow pollution of the waters of our state, you should pay a penalty. That penalty is assessed by you, the jury.

I, obviously, have some suggestions, recommendations, and feel strongly about the amount of the appropriate penalty in this case; but that power is not given to the Harris County Attorney's Office. That is given to the 12 people on this jury, and that is appropriate and rightly so.

So with those two comments, I do want to review the evidence with you that we've heard. We know where the pits are located now. They're located within three and a half miles of the San Jacinto Monument.

And I think we all now know that some things are not in dispute: How did the sludge get to the site, that's not in dispute. What happened to it when it got there, I don't think that's seriously in dispute; but we can talk about that as we get further in my presentation.

And what Champion or International Paper did to stop that sludge containing dioxin from getting out into the river, I don't think that's in dispute either. They did nothing. Nothing. And if you will review the evidence in this case, Champion and International Paper has presented no evidence of anything that they did to stop this sludge containing dioxin from getting out into the river that runs through the heart of our county.

Further facts that I don't think are seriously in dispute: Champion put its paper mill sludge in the San Jacinto River waste pits. There is no other waste there. Harris County told them not to let the waste get into the river at the time. Champion left the sludge it produced in the waste pits and abandoned it, even though it knew as of July 14th, 1966 that that sludge -- that site had a pollution problem.

In 1985, the EPA determined that dioxin was hazardous, and from 1986 to 1989 Champion knew the paper

mill sludge that it was producing by Olympic swimming pool fulls had dioxin in it.

From 1985 it was known that the paper mill sludge containing dioxin may be hazardous to people or in the environment; and neither Champion or International Paper warned anyone about the hazardous dioxin in their sludge. And they did nothing to stop that sludge laced with dioxin from getting into the river. And International Paper merged with Champion in 2000.

The law, as you just heard the judge read, summarizes if you cause, suffer, allow or permit industrial waste containing dioxin to discharge into the waters of the State of Texas, you are required by law to pay a penalty.

Now, I've organized the documents that you've heard about so many times into a timeline that I want to review for the purpose of your deliberations. Champion Paper Company in the 1960's knew that it needed to get rid of waste they produced from its paper mill and dispose of it somewhere else. I don't think there's much dispute that if you run a paper mill, you have to run it continuously and you produce Olympic swimming pools filled with sludge and you have to do something with it. That's part of the process of operating a

paper mill.

In 19 -- June '65 you have the Dr. Quebedeaux letters. It has two paragraphs. It is a Reese's Peanut Butter Cup; it has that chocolate and peanut butter, or it's not a Reese's. And if you don't have those two paragraphs, you don't have the letter from Dr. Quebedeaux.

In 1965, Champion hired Ole Peterson to barge its paper mill waste to the San Jacinto River waste pits. The evidence, I think, is undisputed that before doing so, it did no due diligence before hiring Ole Peterson.

MIMC then assumed the contract from Ole
Peterson and began barging Champion's waste to the San
Jacinto pits, and then at the end of that year in
December of -- 28th of 1965, the private Champion
memorandum says that "Attached is a copy of the letter
regarding the disposal of Champion's waste sludge
material." While when it got into the pit, itself, it
may have not been their material as it was being
transported to those waste pits, Champion referred to it
as "Champion's waste sludge material."

Then in May of '66 the State Department of Health identified seepage and problems with the levees of the San Jacinto River waste pits, and then the

Champion July 14th, 1966 memo states, "Because of the pollution problem, it's impractical to consider further dumping at the present location on the San Jacinto River."

Here's a 1955 memorandum which starts this chain: "As of 1955, Champion knew that if it wanted to dump this sludge at sea, it would have to take it out 110 miles and put it in 400 fathoms of water." That's what this sludge was.

Dr. Quebedeaux's June 11th letter was to Burma Engineering. You've heard so many times they say that Dr. Quebedeaux approved the site and the location. He did. And every time he did so, he said, "I would like to remind you again that your waste handling operation should be done in a manner which would not allow any liquid waste to leave the property."

His December 28th, 1965 letter specifically stated that his approval was only under the condition that the waste handling operation should be done in a manner in which would never -- not allow any liquid waste to leave the property and escape into the river. He noted again that the dikes being used to contain the waste should be repaired.

This is just a repeat of the Private
Champion Memorandum in which they recognized their

connection to the waste handling, waste sludge material and they also noted that "I am sure we all realize the sensitive nature of this entire operation and the need for special precaution in connection with the disposal of this waste material."

And here's the Champion July 14th, 1968
Appropriation Request form in which they recognize that because of the pollution problem, "It is impractical to consider further dumping at the present location on the San Jacinto River." And the evidence is undisputed that after the date of this memorandum, there was no investigation by San Jacinto River -- no investigation by Champion or later International Paper to find out what that pollution problem was or to do anything about it.

As of August of 1968, the MIMC Board Minutes reflect that these pits were completely filled with sludge material, completely filled; and that's going to become important when we look at what is in those pits now. If you'll remember, there's A, B, and C pits; and now there is no B or C pits because the contents of those pits are gone.

And here's an aerial -- the timeline reflecting the 1973 breach in the berms in which the -- there's a connection between the waters of the San

Jacinto River and the B and C pits. Here's the A pit, B pit, and C pit. And all of those days are highlighted in red because of Dr. Pardue and Dr. Bedient's testimony that every day during that period of time, there was a release of dioxin into the San Jacinto River.

In 1985 is when the EPA listed dioxin as a hazardous substance. In 1985. And then from 1986 through 1989 is when the EPA, in connection with the industry, did a study on what comes out of paper mills; and we're going to see the testimony in which Champion was part of that study and Champion knew during that study that its paper mill sludge contained dioxin, which was hazardous -- which the EPA had designated as a hazardous substance in 1985.

And the Five Mill and the 104 Mill studies confirmed that the paper mill sludge coming out of paper mills, one of them being a Champion facility, had dioxin in it. The evidence is also undisputed that after that period of time, no one at Champion went back and looked into what was going on at the site where they had transported or had MIMC transport their sludge.

At the end of that penalty period in 1989, we know from this survey that approximately two-thirds of the impoundments were submerged and inundated by the San Jacinto River. Champion merged with International

Paper in 2000, and this site was designated as a Superfund site in 2008.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The testimony in this case is also that after International Paper merged with Champion, they did no due diligence other than looking at public filings to find out if Champion had any environmental issues or issues with particular regard to this site. It's the same timeline in a different setting, and I won't belabor it here.

Remember, Dr. Joan Meyer testified in this case from the stand about the relationship between the different corporations. The one that's important for us now today is the relationship between Champion Paper and International Paper. There was a corporate transaction in March of 2000. International Paper merged with Condor Acquisitions, and then they all merged together.

So as of June of 2000, International Paper and Champion merged together, which is why you have the different date range on the Charge.

We heard from a couple of International Paper corporate representatives, one of them being Thomas Duckert. He testified that Champion and International Paper did nothing to contain the paper mill sludge laced with dioxin during the penalty period. He also testified that the -- Champion's president, the

25

highest officer in the company, was briefed about the waste disposal problem at the Texas division and that sludge from the plant basins was being disposed in a low, marshy, bayou area.

He confirmed that one of the five mill studies in the EPA Five Mill Study from 1986 to 1989 was a Champion mill and that Champion did nothing after the five mill study about the site.

International Paper did no due diligence before merging with Champion; and because this was some time ago, I have a clip of Mr. Dukert's testimony. I think it's approximately 2 minutes:

(Video played as follows:

"QUESTION: Prior to March 31st of 2008, when is the -- when did Champion take -- or International Paper take any action to investigate the site and any releases of contamination from the site?

"ANSWER: As far as I know, International Paper became aware of issues when it became a Superfund site; and beyond that, I think there's going to be some additional expert testimony along those lines. And that's what I recall.

"QUESTION: The five mills used in the -in the EPA Five Mill Study, is one of those mills a
Champion mill?

"ANSWER: Yes, I believe one is a Champion 1 I don't remember the exact name. 2 mill. 3 "QUESTION: And the Five Mill Study was concluded in the latter half of the '80s? 4 5 "ANSWER: Yes. I recall the EPA published a document on that study. The study occurred mid-'80s 6 7 and that document may have been published '87/'88 time 8 frame, after the fieldwork had been done and the data 9 was analyzed. 10 "QUESTION: And after the Five Mill Study, 11 there was a more extensive study done by the EPA? 12 "ANSWER: That's correct. I believe it was 13 a 104 Mill Study, is the way it was characterized. 14 "QUESTION: And, generally, what -- what the Five Mill Study showed was that for those plants 15 that participated, there were elevated levels of dioxin 16 downstream of their outflows? 17 18 "ANSWER: The best way I can remember, 19 there were -- there were various -- let me put it this 20 way, I would have to review the document to tell you exactly what that document said. 21 22 "QUESTION: After the Five Mill Study was 23 published, did International Paper or Champion go back 24 to the site underlying this lawsuit and conduct any sort 25 of investigation into what was contained within the

parameters of the site?

"ANSWER: The -- I did not review any documents that indicated that any such task was undertaken.

"QUESTION: Have you, as International Paper's representative, seen any record that other waste was deposited at the site, aside from waste from the Champion Pasadena paper mill?

"ANSWER: The documents indicate that the only waste that was taken to this particular site was from the Pasadena mill."

(Whereupon, the video concluded)

MR. WOTRING: That is the 104 Mill Study. It is in evidence as Exhibit No. 691, and what it confirms and was published and what Champion knew was that the sludge coming out of its facility contained dioxin. And as of this date, the EPA had determined that dioxin was, itself, a hazardous substance.

The Five Mill Study took place again from 1986 to 1989. At the end of that period of time, the site was underwater, and the evidence is undisputed that Champion and then International Paper did nothing about that sludge to stop it from getting into the river. It permitted, it caused, it suffered, it allowed that sludge containing dioxin to get into the San Jacinto

River every day.

Peter Maples is the other International Paper corporate representative that testified in this case, and he testified that International Paper did no due diligence when merging with Champion Paper, other than look at public filings. International Paper did not look at documents at any Champion facility to see if there might be any environmental issues before merging with the company.

And that's a guess to you that if Champion and International Paper have to pay nothing for doing no due diligence about previous environmental problems, then that's the type of due diligence that companies will do in the future when trying to buy and merge with each other. None. They have to pay nothing in this case for failing to identify problems at this Champion facility, then that is what will be going on in the future in other corporate transactions.

(Video played as follows:)

"QUESTION: Do you know if prior to issuing this public disclosure that International Paper did any due diligence with regard to any environmental liabilities associated with Champion?

"ANSWER: So prior to making this offer --

"QUESTION: Yes.

"ANSWER: Your question is, prior to making 1 this offer, did IP do any due diligence? 2 3 "QUESTION: For environmental liabilities associated with acquiring Champion? 4 5 "ANSWER: My understanding is that IP reviewed publicly-available documents, SCC documents, 6 7 and anything else publicly available. 8 "QUESTION: So there was no -- prior to 9 April 25th, 2000, International Paper didn't conduct any other type of due diligence for Champion regarding 10 environmental liabilities, other than what would have 11 12 been publicly available? "ANSWER: Correct 13 14 In your review of the documents "QUESTION: in getting ready to answer questions based on Topic No. 15 16 4, the transaction by which Champion became part of or affiliated with IPC, you didn't see any International 17 18 Paper documents reflecting their review of the documents 19 located at any Champion facility or Champion's 20 headquarters? 21 "ANSWER: Correct. I did not see any 22 review of documents located at Champion's headquarters 23 or any other location." 24 (Whereupon, the video concluded) 25 MR. WOTRING: International Paper's concern

was not with looking at what potential problems Champion might have had prior to merging with Champion in 2000. It didn't look at any documents at any facilities, and I would suggest to you what I think you already know that it is Champion and International Paper, as they claim, pay no penalties in this case, then that's the type of due diligence that companies will do in the future. They will not do due diligence to find out what other sludge pits are out in communities on riverbanks because it will be far cheaper and better to do no due diligence and be able to claim that they didn't know.

You heard from Captain Frank Ruiz briefly that he observed people fishing around the sites. This is a recreational area. People fish along the banks near the pits. People fish near the pits from boats. People use this river for recreation.

We've seen the aerial photographs. I'll run through them quickly. This is the 1973 photo showing the breach in the berm because there was no maintenance, no action was taken with regard to this site, no concern about what might happen to it, no effort to warn anybody about what happened to the site.

And I would suggest to you what I think you already know is that if Champion and International Paper are correct, that they should pay nothing in this case,

not one dollar for one day of penalty, and that is the type of maintenance, that is the type of care, and that is the type of action and reaction that will happen for pits containing sludge laced with dioxin in the future.

Champion and International Paper's experts tell you that these pits, which are submerged under the waters of the San Jacinto River, were not releasing daily dioxin or the contents of the paper mill sludge, that they are asking you to disregard the evidence that your own eyes are telling you is that when we put cardboard underwater and submerge it there for weeks, months, and years at a time, that cardboard comes apart, breaks apart, and gets into the water column.

Here's the survey; and it's dated the last day of June, 1989. This is the date that these pits were inundated and submerged beneath the waters of the San Jacinto River. It's undisputed during this period of time that International -- Champion did nothing with respect to this site, even though it had known as of July 4th, 1966, that there was a pollution problem at this site.

And I would suggest to you what I think you already know, is that if Champion and International Paper have to pay nothing in this case, for not one

dollar for one day of violations, that that's what companies will do when they know there's a pollution problem, nothing. Here's a close-up of the survey result.

We've heard something about dredging in this case. It may be the only thing the defendants have talked about with respect to this site and that is that somebody else dredged. I think the evidence in this case is that from their own experts, Dr. Zoch and Dr. Johns, that any dredging affecting this site did not happen until 1996 or 1997.

And, again, Champion and International Paper did nothing with respect to warning anybody about dioxin at the site, didn't so much as put up a sign, didn't attempt to warn anybody, didn't take any action with respect to stopping the dioxin at the site. They did nothing to warn anybody about dredging at the site. They didn't alert anyone about the existence of this site. They washed their hands of the sludge that they produced from their mill and did nothing with respect to warning anybody about dredging, even though they knew that it was on the banks of the San Jacinto River.

And I would suggest again, what I think you already know, that if in this case Champion and International Paper would have to pay nothing, not one

dollar for one day of penalties, then that's what companies will do with respect to taking responsibility for warning people about the hazardous materials contained in their waste products, nothing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1989. There's the figure showing again that these pits are under water. In 1995, still in connection with the waters of the San Jacinto River.

2005. We now see evidence of dredging, I think, from their experts, in the northwest corner. don't think there's a credible suggestion in this case that any dredging affected the B and C pit impoundments here, which in this are already under water.

We brought you the testimony of Dr. Pardue and Dr. Bedient, who testified that in reasonable scientific probability, that every day starting on February 15th, 1973, there were daily releases of dioxin into the waters of the San Jacinto River, a river that runs through the heart of Harris County.

I won't review Dr. Pardue's qualifications, simply to touch on a couple of them. He's the co-director of the EPA Hazardous Substance Research Center. He's consulted on numerous Superfund sites, including the Passaic River where there's also a dioxin issue. He's the director of the Louisiana Water Resources Research Institute. He's a professor at LSU.

25

He testified that there is no record of any maintenance of the berms from February 15th, 1973 through March 30th, 2008, that the breach in the impoundments from February 15th, 1973 forward caused daily releases. He told us that the sludge that was contained in those pits had the consistency of water and that once wet cardboard gets wet, it becomes more vulnerable to breaking apart and that paper mill sludge and dioxins were releasing every day on particles or on suspended solids, part of the colloids and suspended solids coming from the paper mill waste.

If you'll remember this slide, this shows
Pits B and C are gone. He reviewed with us the
groundwater monitoring results from this monitoring
well, which reflect that the water inside the waste,
even today, contains dioxin dissolved in it.

He testified about the sampling locations up and down the river and how that supported his opinion in reasonable scientific probability more likely than not that there are daily releases of dioxin from the San Jacinto River.

He testified about the sampling above the pits showing dioxin dissolved in the water column. We brought you the testimony of Dr. Phil Bedient who is the Herman Brown Professor of Engineering for Rice

University. He's the Chair of the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering at Rice University here in our town.

He told you, based upon sampling results near the location and elsewhere, the dioxin was releasing from these pits on a daily basis. The water from the river and rainwater would erode the levees. Water from inside the pits was going to exchange with water from the river starting from February 15th of 1973 and that the breaches shown in every aerial photograph after that date. There was no repair work done to change the condition of the berm and that water from inside the pits would exchange with water from the river starting on February 15th of 1973.

I've put some quotes because of length of time between today and the time he testified: "I believe that within reasonable scientific certainty that there were discharges each and every day from February 15, 1973 going forward." He confirms what I don't think is disputed at this point in time, that this site was submerged by July 1st, 1989, and that "For every day thereafter going forward in time, there is no question in my mind that there were releases of dioxin coming out of these pits. They're in direct connection now, inundation from the river on a daily basis..."

I don't know if you need an expert to say that wet cardboard when you submerge it under a river breaks apart and would release its contents on a daily basis, but Drs. Pardue and Bedient gave us that testimony. And more on his sampling locations and how those supported his opinions, his chart reflecting the concentrations and samplings that supported his opinion that dioxin was releasing every day in reasonable scientific probability.

And that takes us to the Jury Charge. I'll have more to say after the defendants go, but we have to walk through the Jury Charge because these are the questions and this is the work you are tasked to do now.

And the first question you are asked is:
"Did you find that any of the following Defendants
caused, suffered, allowed or permitted the discharge of
industrial waste containing dioxin into or adjacent to
any water in the state at any time from February 15th,
1973 until March 30th, 2008?"

And in reasonable probability, I don't think there's any question that Champion and International Paper -- the answer to this question is "Yes."

Question No. 2. Given the date ranges there, about what dates there are releases of dioxin, I

don't think there's any question that every day during the penalty period, which is February 15th, 1973 on through March 30th of 2008, there were daily releases of industrial waste containing dioxin and, therefore, the date ranges should be complete date ranges for Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 -- or I'm sorry, 1, 2, 3, and for International Paper the date range is one from December 31st to 2000 every day during that period of time there were releases of dioxin and every day should be included in your calculations.

Question No. 3 gets into the penalty ranges, and you are the determiners of what the penalties should be in this case. And Harris County would submit that the appropriate penalty in this case for permitting dioxin to get out of these impoundments during the penalty period from February 1973 through March of 2008 is the maximum amount, \$1,000 a day from February 1973 through August of 1985.

The date range of September 1st, 1985 to August 31st, 1997, the appropriate penalty is \$10,000 a day. The next date range is September 1st through December 30th, it is \$25,000 a day.

Champion knew as of that date range that its paper mill sludge was laced with dioxin, and it did nothing to go back and figure out, to stop, to warn, to

do anything to stop that from happening on a daily basis. It also knew at that point in time in 1985 that dioxin was a hazardous substance.

But you are the determiners of what the appropriate penalty should be, and Harris County will accept your judgment, as it must.

For International Paper, from

December 30th, 2000 to March 30th, 2008, the appropriate penalty is, again, \$25,000 a day. If International Paper was going to buy a paper company and conduct no due diligence, it took the environmental problems that company may have had and the appropriate penalty is \$25,000 a day.

With respect to Question 4: "Do you find that any of the following Defendants caused, suffered, allowed, or permitted the handling or disposal of industrial solid waste containing dioxin in such a manner so as to cause the discharge or imminent threat of discharge of industrial solid waste containing dioxin into or adjacent to the waters of the State at any time from December 31st, 1975 until March 30th, 2008?"

The answer is without doubt "Yes" for Champion and International Paper.

And then for Question No. 5, for those date ranges, given the testimony from Dr. Bedient and

Dr. Pardue, every day there was a release of dioxin connected with the paper mill sludge from the Champion facility placed in these impoundments.

And again in Question No. 6, you are the ultimate determiner of what is the appropriate penalty; and Harris County would submit that every day should be reflective of the maximum penalty in this amount because dioxin -- it was known that there was a pollution problem at the site. Dioxin was known to be a hazardous substance, and nothing was done by Champion or International Paper to stop its ongoing release.

Question No. 7 addresses the penalty -- or the attorney's fees that my firm has incurred for Harris County in bringing this action, and Harris County would submit that the evidence presented to you was that my firm incurred \$10.6 million. We would reduce that by 15 percent to reflect the amount that was done on causes of action and claims for which we are not seeking attorney's fees, reducing that amount to \$9 million.

You've heard the testimony about -- that we have not been paid for any portion of this case, that the nine-million-dollar figure is calculated using \$900 an hour to reflect the risk that we may not be paid at all.

I will confess --

MR. CARTER: Your Honor, I object to that.

THE COURT: Approach.

(After a bench discussion outside the hearing of the reporter and jury, the following proceedings were had:)

MR. WOTRING: But let me also confess that seeking attorney's fees is more than a little awkward, and in a case like this it's more than a little awkward because I don't want it to get in the way of you, the jury, doing the right thing with respect to addressing the questions that need to be addressed about what companies should do about pollution problems.

And on behalf of Harris County and on behalf of my firm, I'll accept whatever judgment you-all want to do with respect to attorney's fees. That is -- you are the determiners of the credibility of the parties and the witnesses, and we'll live with whatever determination you want to make.

You've also heard that we will get paid out of a percentage up to a certain amount of whatever penalties. That is true. And we will live with whatever determination you want to make. If that determination is we should not get paid under Question 7, we will live with that.

We -- we have considered this an

unbelievable honor to be able to represent the people of Harris County in this matter by being hired by their government. If we were not to get paid, then we would consider that a public service and a worthy, worthy public service and many people served and don't get paid and we would accept your judgment on that particular issue.

We don't want this issue about attorney's fees to get in the way of what is the appropriate penalty to be levied in this case. The fact of the matter is, you can't bring one of these cases without having somebody like me and Ms. Baker and Mr. George and Mr. Muir and Mr. Rodriguez come to court prepared to present the case as we have done in this matter.

But the evidence in the case is that we have incurred \$9 million in fees for bringing this case. The hourly rate is at \$900. We set it that way at the beginning of the case to reflect the possibility that we might not get paid. If you were to calculate our rate, our hours at a different rate, we would live with your determination, as we must; and we would accept that.

And that gets us into the next question,

Question No. 8, the "act of God" defense. And the

question here is: "Were any of the violations you found

in Questions One or Four" -- and One and Four are the

questions about: "Were there daily releases caused solely by an act of God?" Solely.

I think in connection with this this means only by an act of God, and an act of God is a defined defense. And it says "an occurrence is caused by an act of God if it's caused directly and exclusively by the violence of nature without human intervention or cause and could not have been prevented by reasonable foresight or care."

Subsidence is not an act of God, as you heard about. It's not a violent act of nature like a storm or a hurricane or a flood. There's been some discussion of floods and hurricanes in some of the documents and some of the argument of counsel; but there's been no evidence presented to you that any of the daily discharges were caused by solely an act of God. And, therefore, we think the answer for both Champion and International Paper to Question No. 8 is "No."

And, therefore, for Question No. 9, you do not need to fill out any daily ranges because that's how you're instructed by the Court, which is to move from Question 8 to Question 10 if you answer "No."

Then we get to Question 10, which asks you a very specific question; and if you work through that,

the question is: "On any day after September 1st, 1997, were any of the Defendants listed below also a person responsible for solid waste? Answer only for the Defendants that you have determined committed violations in Question Four," and we think when you work through this, that both Champion and International Paper fall within No. 3, by contract, agreement or a person who otherwise arranged to process, store, or dispose of solid waste" as reflected there.

But then you get into Question No. 11, which asks you: "Were any of the violations you found in Question Four caused solely by acts or omissions of a third person?" We think the answer there, based upon the evidence in this record, is quite clearly "No" and "No." So, therefore, you would skip Question No. 12 and move directly to the end for No. 25.

That's going to conclude my first part of the opening argument. We appreciate your time and your consideration of this case. I will stress again that I know this is an incredible imposition to place on people, to take them out of their normal daily working lives, their normal routine, what they do in their jobs; but I can't stress enough the importance of this particular case because I don't think there is any more important deliberation going on in this country right

now than the deliberation you-all are about to start on, 1 2 what are the appropriate penalties in this case. 3 With that, I'll sit down and speak with you in a few moments. 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wotring. Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to 6 7 take a brief break and we'll bring you back in -- I 8 apologize. We're going to go ahead and take care of Mr. Benedict first, because he's shorter, and then we'll 10 take a break. But everybody got to stand up and 11 stretch. Sit back down. 12 CLOSING ARGUMENT 13 BY MR. BENEDICT: 14 Good morning. 15 THE JURY: Good morning. 16 I wish I could stand up here MR. BENEDICT: and say it's very brief, so we can get on to break; but 17 18 I do need to talk to you about a couple of things. Ιt 19 won't take long, so we can get to the break. 20 I almost feel like I need to reintroduce 21 myself. You haven't heard much from me. I'm the guy, 22 the lawyer representing the Texas Commission on

Environmental Quality. That's the state environmental

agency that you've heard called the "TCEQ" throughout

23

24

25

the case.

And the TCEQ, as it was explained upfront, is a party when a local government files a suit like this, the TCEQ is made a necessary and indispensable party.

What I want to talk to you about today, there have been a couple things that TCEQ has been talked about and I don't recollect they're that important and I normally don't talk about things unimportant, but I think they might be distractions. I just want to talk to you because I don't want the TCEQ to be a distraction for you to consider these issues that Mr. Wotring has talked to you about the importance of it.

And the first distraction is -- we're back to is "They're seeking too much." I know Mr. Wotring has talked about that. I think you've heard "billions" mentioned a few times, even "waste pit lottery" and that the TCEQ and Harris County are overreaching in a case on penalties. There's nothing wrong with people asking for something. What is the old saying, "You don't get what you don't ask for?" The problem is it doesn't mean anything because you are the ones that decide the issue.

If you think somebody is asking for too much, it's your decision. If you think TCEQ asked for too much money, give them what you think is appropriate,

if you think any is appropriate. You are the one in control of that. And so I'm concerned when he talks about the TCEQ wants too much money, that becomes a distraction from the issues that you are deciding, the issues that the Court just went through and read to you.

I don't recall hearing a single question that was read, "Did the TCEQ want too much money? Is the TCEQ playing waste pit lottery? Is the TCEQ overreaching?" That question is not in there. The question would be, "How much do you think should be awarded as a penalty?"

That's what is important. So when you hear somebody -- if they come up and tell you the TCEQ is asking for too much, it doesn't mean anything because you are in control of that. But I also think it's a little bit unfair to say that.

Remember, the TCEQ is here because the statute says we are. The TCEQ gets half the penalty because the statute says that we do. And let's be candid. I don't think I've talked long enough in this trial to overreach on anything. I don't think I have asked for anything.

So I just -- again, I don't think that's an important issue; but I don't want that to be a distraction. And if there's any question about that,

the TCEQ is simply asking you to go back into the room, to follow the directions that the Court has given, the instructions, to read the Charge and answer the questions to the best of your ability, not the questions that may be posed, not distractions, but the questions in the Charge. That's the only thing I'm going to ask you to do. And if there was any other belief, I didn't want to create that perception. I didn't want that to be a distraction.

The second one is way back in opening you heard some references and you've seen it mentioned in evidence two or three times in 19 -- excuse me, a 2005 letter from the Texas Parks & Wildlife to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality saying, "There's some waste pits out here and there's dredging causing a problem." I don't think that's accurate. The letter was sent. That's in evidence. You can go back and look at it. No question about it.

But the distraction is what happened next. The suggestion was made that for three years after that, the TCEQ did nothing; and I wanted to address that briefly because that's just a complete irrelevancy. It's a distraction, and I don't want the TCEQ to distract you from the issues that you are going to decide in the Charge that the Court has presented to

1 you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To begin with, Dr. Johns and Mr. Zoch, the two experts that the Defendants put up here, there was no dredging going on in 2005. So what does it matter? Dredging, if any, that was done was done long before that. So if TCEQ didn't do anything after 2005, whether it was 2 years, 3 years, 6 months, or for 20 years, it doesn't matter because the dredging was done.

But the second thing is that statement just wasn't fair and it wasn't true. You may recall the stipulation, and that's the only thing I'm going to read, and I'll try to read it slowly, that the parties read earlier is that "After the TCEQ received the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department's April 2005 letter regarding dredging, the TCEQ continued sampling sediments as part of the Total Maximum Daily Load Water Quality Study of the Houston Ship Channel and participated with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, in investigating the site. The investigation efforts are documented in a five-volume report of approximately 2,000 pages, dated September 2006, and entitled 'Screening Site Inspection Report' prepared by the TCEQ and submitted to the EPA." In October of 2008, the TCEQ requested the

United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Corps of

Engineers, to suspend the dredging permit, which had been extended by the Corps of Engineers in December of 2007.

Now, I don't know how other people define nothing; but going out and conducting thorough investigations, generating a 2,000-page report, working with the TCEQ, doesn't sound like nothing to me; working with KIM LISTEN the Pappadeauxs believe doesn't sound like nothing. And, of course, we all know that by 2008 the stipulation is the EPA had already made this a Superfund site.

I'm raising it because, again, there's not a question, "Did the TCEQ do anything after 2005?" I don't want that to be a distraction. It's not a fair characterization. The evidence is contrary to it, and I don't want the TCEQ to distract you from answering the important questions that Mr. Wotring talked to you about.

That's really all I have to say. I'll let you get on with your break. I do want to thank you again for being here and again repeat that the only request that I have of you is that, based on the evidence you've heard and the instructions from the Court, that you fairly -- this is to the best of your ability to answer the questions in the Charge; and if

you do that, I'm happy. I may or may not like the 1 2 answers, but you've done your job, and that's all I can 3 ask. Thank you very much. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Benedict. 5 All right, ladies and gentlemen, at this 6 7 time we'll take a brief recess. 8 (After a break, the jury was present and 9 the following proceedings were had:) 10 THE COURT: Please be seated. 11 You may proceed, Mr. Carter. 12 MR. CARTER: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 CLOSING ARGUMENT 14 MR. CARTER: I didn't think this moment 15 would ever get here. It's one of the defining moments of a trial, and that's to be able to speak back to the 16 17 jury after jury selection and to be able to speak again 18 directly to you concerning the evidence in the case and 19 to summarize what we think are the important points for 20 you to take back into the jury room. 21 It has been a long time, and there has been 22 gaps in time, and I know that memories fail us. We're 23 going to go back through some of the evidence, and I 24 have prepared a PowerPoint presentation, as well.

Going back to the first day in jury

25

selection, I had the opportunity to speak with Ms. Cole and thank her for her military service. This is one of those times that is protected by our military personnel, and that's to have the opportunity to come before you, 12 people who also have had a service, taken their time, taking their daily lives, and to listen to a dispute between other people. I thank you for your service, just as I thank Ms. Cole for her service.

I've been practicing for 35 years, and I've talked -- during that time I've talked with a number of people, a number of other lawyers from all over the world. And I've talked to them about their -- the way they do things in trials, and there's no system -- although it's imperfect, it can be slow, it can be inefficient; but I'll come before you today, there's no other system in the world that is like our jury system.

I thank you again for that service, and there's no other place where I can have the confidence to stand before you and look at the government, the power of the government, and argue to you that we have done nothing wrong. That's the reason we are still here. We are still here.

You don't see MIMC and you don't see Waste Management here because they've settled; but we are still here because we did nothing wrong. And we're

going to go through the evidence now to show you why in connection -- and you may remember from the first day that we were here in opening statements. You may remember I said you need to listen to what the judge tells you in connection with the Charge, because the Charge is going to be the most important document that you see.

This document, ladies and gentlemen, is the contract. It's the contract between you and Judge Baker. Just like with any contract, the words in this document are very important.

You don't see any -- you will not see any word such as "warning" in this document. You're not going to see that. That's the reason these -- this Charge is very important and it's very important to look at the words and phrases that are used within the document, and we're going to go through that.

We acted responsibly and with the County's approval. And just to go back through a few of the facts and the stipulation back at the first day of trial, IP is paying to remediate the site that the County approved. This isn't about cleanup. This isn't about payment for the cleanup out there. IP has stepped up to the plate and done that. It is working to remediate this site.

Going back to 1965 and '66 when -- and going back to my photograph when I was in the fourth grade, that's when this happened. Champion hired a contractor to dispose of waste between those years, hired a contractor.

MIMC, no longer here, hired them to dispose of this waste. The County -- the County, itself, sat back there with Dr. Quebedeaux, the only person that could approve it. The County pre-approved the site before any work was ever done.

Champion required its contractor in the contract -- and the contract is in evidence, and I ask you to review it -- required its contractor not only to meet, and we're going to go through this, but also to exceed the environmental standards that were in effect at the time.

Champion entered into a contract with its contractor only after getting the County's approval. Champion did not cause any release at the site. We had no power to control or maintain the site. And most importantly -- and he said we failed to maintain. We're going to get to that because I want to refer to you the evidence in that.

But regarding the power to prevent, the power to prevent -- and when Judge Baker read you the

instructions, and we're going to go through this in a minute, the power to prevent, "cause, suffer, allow or permit" requires the power.

What power would that be coming from a judge? It must be the legal power to prevent.

IP is already paying to remediate the site, and that's what we've talked about. The County is trying to change the rules on you. That's what they're really trying to do.

The General Discharge Statute -- and remember, I held up those three statutes. Well, No. 1, one of the statutes that we were wrongly accused of -- that's true -- we were wrongly accused of it. That statute is out, and that's the Texas Spill Act. We have two left. We have two left; the General Discharge Statute -- that statute didn't get passed until seven years -- until seven years after the disposal. So the General Discharge Statute didn't even come into effect until 1973, and this disposal was done in 1966.

So did we have the power to prevent an event that occurred in 1973 when we didn't own the land? We didn't own the waste. We didn't have any contract with the -- with the contractor at that point in time. We had no contract with the landowner at that point in time. Did we have the power to prevent a release at

that point or any day thereafter?

That's what this case is about, and we're going to get to the instructions on that.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act didn't even get passed until 9 years after Champion no longer owned waste and no longer had a contract for the disposal.

There's no reason to punish Champion or IP.

Did we do anything wrong? No. Was

Champion and IP responsible for maintaining the site?

No. Was it Champion that caused, suffered, permitted, or allowed the release of dioxin? No. Did the County approve a daily release? Did their evidence come forward -- the evidence that they brought to you prove a daily release? No. And we're going to show you why.

Is this case about protecting the environment? The stipulation that the judge read to you and told you that this case -- what it was not about at the beginning, and we're going to go through that. It's not about protecting the environment. It's about penalties, about them trying to punish us, wrongly accusing us of doing something wrong that we did not do.

Does the County deserve any money from Champion or IP? Absolutely not.

Now, we were going to handle this -- folks, I'm going to take the first two. Did Champion and IP do anything wrong and was Champion and IP responsible for maintaining the site? I'm going to take those first two and then Dave -- Mr. Schrader, Dave is going to come back and he's going to talk to you about the second two. Was it IP that "caused, suffered, allowed or permitted" an approved daily release? And then I'm going to come back to you and finish with a few closing remarks on the last two.

So let's roll on this. Did Champion and IP do anything wrong? Here's the instruction from the Court, and on the Charge it's on Page 6. It will again appear on Page 12. Interestingly, there wasn't anything said about the government about that. That's because they would like to forget this.

"You are instructed that the mere fact that Champion Paper generated the waste" -- so, in other words, the fact that we're just the waste generator and the fact that we "contracted with an independent waste disposal company," MIMC, "for its disposal is not, by itself, sufficient to establish that Champion Paper is liable for any discharge."

So let me give you an example. If you say, "Well, Champion -- Champion just generated the waste, they must be responsible." Judge Baker has told you that's not enough. A mere generation of the waste is

not enough.

Well, wait a second. What about this?
Well, they also contracted with an independent waste disposal contractor, MIMC, to dispose of the waste.

That's not enough. There has to be more for there to be "cause, suffer, allow or permit."

The fact that we had a contractor disposal, the fact that we generated the waste is not enough under her instructions to answer Question 1 any other way but "No." Okay.

Now, here -- here is Harris County's own witness -- and, look, we don't just have regular cites up here. We've taken it from the trial testimony. Kim has done an outstanding job of giving us daily copies of the transcripts every day. So we've been able to come back and put before you on November 4th, the trial testimony of Dr. Bedient was:

"QUESTION: All -- all that Champion did was contract with the company to have material hauled from the paper mill and taken to the site; is that right?" That's all Champion did.

Under this instruction, ladies and gentlemen, that's not enough. I could sit down now.

You would answer Question 1 "No" to Champion, "No" to International Paper; and Question 4, "No" to

```
1
   International Paper, and "No" to Champion and that's the
   end of the case.
2
3
                 There's more, though. There's more.
   Dr. Bedient, Harris County's own witness:
4
                 "QUESTION: Champion didn't design the
5
   impoundments at the site, did they?
6
7
                 "ANSWER: I don't believe so.
8
                 "QUESTION: Champion did not construct the
9
   impoundments at the site, did they?
10
                           That's -- you're correct."
                 "ANSWER:
11
                 Who did that? Those people that are no
12
   longer there, MIMC. I could understand why they're no
   longer here.
13
14
                 "QUESTION:
                             Nor did International Paper.
15
   Correct?
                 "ANSWER: I think you're correct.
16
17
                             They didn't design the levees
                 "QUESTION:
18
   at the impoundments?
19
                 "ANSWER: That's correct.
20
                 "QUESTION: They didn't build them?
                 "ANSWER:
                           No."
21
22
                 What he's saying is we had no involvement
23
   in the design, construction, maintenance of the
24
   impoundments; and we're going to get to maintenance in
25
   just a moment.
```

1 This is ALL that Champion did:

"You are instructed that the mere fact that Champion Paper generated the waste and contracted with an independent waste disposal company for its disposal is not, by itself, sufficient to establish that Champion Paper is liable for any discharge."

So where you see that is on Page 6, and it's going to be down here in Question 1. It's going to be in the third paragraph where you're going to read that where it's indented. And that instruction exists right there, Page 6 in Question 1 and on Page 12 in Question 4.

But there's more. The County approves it.

We've shown you this e-mail -- e-mail. We've shown you
these notes of telephone conversations between MIMC -excuse me, between International Paper and

Dr. Quebedeaux.

"Burns' method of developing a pond and storing these waste materials at the mouth of the San Jacinto River," he approved. "Burns' method at this moment the most satisfactory of any that he knew of."

Here is the County talking. And now they want to punish us for something that they approved?

Champion acted only after the County's approval. Remember, when you get back you'll have these

exhibits, and I want you to look at Dr. Quebedeaux's letters, because when you review those letters -- and I'm talking about the Reese's Peanut Butter Cup deal, one paragraph and the other, those letters are addressed to the contractor. They're not addressed to Champion. He's giving the approval to the contractor to do this work and to make sure that the contractor doesn't let the water get into the San Jacinto River.

Those letters are not addressed to Champion because Dr. Quebedeaux knew -- Dr. Quebedeaux knew that the contractor was the one responsible for the work and he knew that the contractor was the one who was going to be responsible for making sure because they were constructing the dikes. They were building the impoundments.

And in the December '65 letter, if you look at that, you'll see that it was written to the contractor, McGinnes, MIMC. He was talking to the contractor, not to Champion.

Champion required the contractor to comply with the laws. This is language straight from the -- from the maintenance -- from the contract where we asked, where we paid for, a quarter of a million dollars, where we paid for MIMC to take our waste and deposit it in a site that was approved by the County to

MIMC that they would take responsibility for. And here we're telling them to make sure you do it right. That's what you want a company like Champion to do. That's what you want someone to do, is to make sure that when something is done, that their contractor does it right. That's what we did.

Bob Zoch, you heard him testify on October the 30th. "So for Champion to have required their contractor to approach Dr. Quebedeaux...for approval went above and beyond normal practice at the time."

We were doing more. We were doing more than what the people back in the day, back in the day, were doing with their waste. So there's no reason to punish IP, because Champion and IP didn't do anything wrong.

Was Champion and IP responsible for maintaining the site? The government's lawyer just stood up here and told you that we were responsible for maintaining the site. Let's look at their -- let's look at what he says about this.

"This case is not about putting the paper mill sludge in the impoundments at the beginning." So it's not about -- he told you this in opening statement. In opening statement he said, "This case is not about

```
putting the paper mill sludge in the impoundments at the
1
   beginning." It's not about the disposal.
2
3
                 "And, again, I want to go back to the fact
   that this case is not about putting it in the site."
4
5
   Not about the disposal. This is what the lawyer is
   saying in opening statement. "It's about what happened
6
7
   after and the failure to maintain and look after the
8
   sludge for the next 35 years."
                 Let's listen to the evidence. Again, Bob
9
10
   Zoch, everybody agrees that Champion had no duty to
   maintain.
11
12
                 "QUESTION: So if I understand, then,
13
   correctly, Mr. Zoch, in your opinion, neither Champion,
14
   nor International Paper had any maintenance obligations
   regarding this site post the operations ceasing in
15
16
   1966?"
17
                 Now remember, under Question No. 1 the
18
   period of time begins 1973. We're talking about 1966.
19
                 "QUESTION:
                             Did Champion have any
20
   maintenance obligations regarding this site post the
   operations ceasing in 1966?
21
22
                 "ANSWER: Right, that's my opinion..." that
   they did not.
23
24
                 "QUESTION: At that point in time was there
25
   any requirement by Champion, from a regulatory
```

standpoint, to provide ongoing maintenance to the site,ongoing inspections or ongoing monitoring?

"ANSWER: There was no such requirement," by Champion.

That may be why MIMC is not here. The Court instructs you also: "The parties have always agreed that neither Champion Paper nor International Paper has ever owned the property on which the Site is located." The County even admits that we didn't own the property, so we had no ownership interest in this property.

Judge Baker instructs you further: "You are further instructed that as of 1966, Champion Paper no longer owned the waste and no longer had a contract for disposal at the site."

Our contract ended in 1966, in June of 1966. The County owned -- by the way, this was Dr. Ford. His deposition was pretty short, but he said a lot of interesting things. And we brought Dr. Ford to you. That was a witness hired by the County. That was the County's own expert witness that they paid for.

Dr. Ford comes in, and we had to bring his deposition. You might remember it was during our case, and I asked him:

"QUESTION: And back in the '60s, they

didn't have any continuing maintenance obligations on a 1 site they didn't own, right?" 2 3 And what I mean by that is everybody agrees we didn't own the site. 4 "QUESTION: And back in the '60s, they 5 didn't have any continuing maintenance obligations on a 6 7 site they didn't own, right?" 8 This is the County saying there's no reason 9 for us to further maintain the site after the '60s. 10 "ANSWER: That's right. 11 "QUESTION: And in addition, you're not 12 aware of any post-closure requirements at the time these 13 parties ceased, you know, taking waste to that site? I'm not aware of that." 14 "ANSWER: Champion had no post-closure requirements, 15 by their own paid expert saying that we had no reason to 16 maintain the site after 1966. 17 More from Dr. Ford: 18 19 "QUESTION: Would an entity that never 20 owned the site" -- i.e. Champion -- "have any ongoing 21 maintenance obligations after discontinuing its disposal 22 operations on that site? 23 "ANSWER: You're talking about '60s? 24 "QUESTION: Yes. They wouldn't have any 25 ongoing maintenance obligations on a site that they

didn't own, right?

2 "ANSWER: I'm sorry, yes."

Another County witness, Dr. Pardue. He doesn't identify Champion or International Paper for having any responsibility for maintaining these sites. What he doesn't talk about is MIMC.

We addressed Dr. Q's concerns, and we didn't hear from the County for another 40 years until this lawsuit was filed. This is a -- this is the 1965 memo. "The contractor" -- this is the Champion notes. "The contractor" -- and at that point in time we're talking about MIMC. MIMC has repaired the levee, and you may remember that Dr. Quebedeaux was out there and had made a note about one of the levees had some seepage.

"The contractor has repaired the levee, and Dr. Quebedeaux will be invited to inspect the work before disposal operations are resumed."

And what that means is, is that in December of '65, or January of '66, contractor repairs the levee. Quebedeaux is invited to come back out. Operations won't resume, but we know they did. Operations won't resume until Quebedeaux inspects. Obvious -- obvious that Quebedeaux must have come out, inspected and approved the levee, and that's the last time we heard

from Dr. Quebedeaux.

More from Dr. Ford, their own independent expert, their own expert that they paid for:

"QUESTION: And he inspected -- he inspected the -- the method" -- he's talking about Dr. Q here -- "And he inspected the method by which this whole operation was going to take place from removing the sludge from the pits to the transportation, correct?

"ANSWER: Dr. Quebedeaux was very ubiquitous. He was everywhere. He was everywhere. He was a very active man."

Don't you know that if there had been a problem with this site after January of 1966 that Dr. Quebedeaux would have been around to look at it?

In fact, in August of '66 -- you may remember this testimony was early in the case -- in August of '66, after the July '66 memo; and we'll get to that in just a minute, that little budget request issue, he testified, and we read the testimony that he gave; and Dr. Quebedeaux said, "I was responsible for designing," or words to that effect. "I was involved in the designing of the site," and he also said, "The site was designed in such a way so there would be no escape to the river."

Don't you know that if there had been a

problem during the time that we had responsibility for maintenance, which ended in May of '66, no post-closure requirements, no requirement for maintenance, their own witnesses testified to that, don't you know that we would have heard from Dr. Quebedeaux?

And this is the budget request that he mentioned. A budget request. This is all the -- this is the only thing that they have of something talking about pollution. We have -- no one has testified about this. That was back in the day, of course. Nobody referenced it back in the day. We don't have any -- any -- any other documents about it, other than the fact that this document existed.

We don't know what they were talking about, a pollution problem. It certainly wasn't something Quebedeaux was concerned about because we would have heard about it.

"A person 'causes, suffers, allows, or permits' an event when that person" -- this is the key word -- "had the power to prevent an event at the time of the event, but failed to do so." That's in the definitions in Question No. 1, and it's in the definition in Question No. 4. "A person 'causes, suffers, allows, or permits' an event when that person had the power to prevent an event at the time of the

event, but failed to do so."

The time of the event that we're talking about is during the penalty period, starting at the earliest, February the 15th of 1973 under Question No. 1; and then Question No. 4 in 1975. Did we have an obligation to maintain? Did we have the ability to prevent? Did we even, according to Harris County's own witnesses, have the reason to maintain? The answer to that is no, we did not.

So there's no reason to punish IP because we were not responsible for maintaining or preventing any discharge from the site during the penalty period.

I'm going to sit down now for a few minutes. Dave is going to speak to you, and then I'll come back and wrap up. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Schrader.

MR. SCHRADER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good morning, everyone.

THE JURY: Good morning.

MR. SCHRADER: It's been my privilege to represent International Paper in this case, and I have very much appreciated the attention that you've given to me during my examinations. I'm going to ask you for just a little bit more because there are a couple of issues that I need to talk about.

The first question or issue that I'm going to talk about is: Was it Champion or International Paper that caused, suffered, permitted, or allowed a release of dioxin into the San Jacinto River? And the answer to that question, as I'm going to show you, as you've heard already, and we're going to go over, from the County's own witnesses is "No."

Now, there were -- there were some releases of waste material containing dioxin into the San Jacinto River from this site. No question about that. We don't know exactly how many days it happened, whether it was 10 days, 15 days, 20 days; but we do know why it happened and how it happened.

We know that there were third parties, not Champion, not IP, that dug directly into this site with heavy equipment, broke apart the material, and then brought it over to an adjacent area where they separated the sand out and released it back into the water.

And there are scientific methods that are available now, and we're going to talk about this, that allow scientists to tell you where dioxin from a particular site came from. It's called fingerprinting. And you can see that the only dioxin that was released from this site was through that process.

Dr. Johns came in here and testified, and

he was asked: "The dioxin that was found outside of the impoundment that was fingerprinted for the impoundment, your opinion is that it got there from that dredging and sand separation operation; is that right?

"ANSWER: Absolutely. There is no question in my mind."

Now, we've seen this before. This is -you've seen a lot of photos. This one happens to be
from 1998, and you can see in here when the County was
putting on its case, at first they were sort of denying
this and suggesting there was some erosion that was
happening here.

Now I think they acknowledge the evidence is just overwhelming that there is this dredging that occurred in this area here (indicating) of the site, dug into there, dug into there, and then it was brought over to this sand separation area and released back in. And you can even see the plume of material spreading out from there where the material was released back into the site, or released back into the river.

This is Exhibit 298-B. There is dioxin anywhere you look in the San Jacinto River. It comes from all sorts of sources. You've heard about it. It travels in the air from exhaust and it gets deposited into the river, and it will sink down eventually.

But anywhere you test in the San Jacinto River, you're going to find dioxin. That is just the way it is. But there's a way now, a scientifically accepted way, to find out, when you take a sample of dioxin, where did it come from; and the way you do that is by fingerprinting.

And when you look at what happened here, this dioxin was extensively tested. It was fingerprinted. The only dioxin that was fingerprinted for this impoundment is in two places. It's right where it was put originally inside of the impoundment or over here in that sand separation area you can see a little bit got up here and a little bit got over in this area (indicating) where it was released back into the river.

All -- all of this other dioxin that's up here, all of the stuff that's on the top of this chart, all of it that's down here to the side, immediately to the side -- and remember, you heard this theory that there was a breach over in this corner (indicating) that allowed dioxin to release. It was tested, and that's not from this site.

That dioxin all came from other sources.

There is no dioxin anywhere else in the San Jacinto

River except for in those two places, and you have not heard any expert from the County come in here and tell

you any different.

So how did it get there? We asked Dr. Johns: "Is there any other way that that dioxin that is from our site, that's up to the northeast corner, is there any other way that that could have gotten there" other than through the activity that he described; that is, somebody moving it over there and sending it back into the river?

And he said, "No. That's the only way you could have moved it physically upstream and put it over there. That's the only way it could have happened."

Now, I know you've heard from expert witnesses and you understand that they are in here for the parties, right? These are people who come in, and you say "Maybe I shouldn't believe Dr. Johns because he's hired by one of the parties in this case."

He's not alone in this. Everybody who's looked at this, other than the two experts brought in here for the County, agree that that's what happened. This is from 2006 from the State Department of Parks & Wildlife, where Mr. Sipocz says in 2006: "In looking over the more recent data, I believe more firmly that the recent sand mining was responsible for the increase in dioxin levels at the site noted between 1994 and 2002."

So the County's attorneys in this case hired a couple of expert witnesses, despite all the evidence that existed at the time, to come in and testify; and they were both given the same assignment. They were both asked to consider the ways that dioxin could have gotten out of this site.

Pardue, one of the two things he was asked to do was to consider the ways dioxin could have gotten out of the site.

Bedient: "Yesterday you testified that what you were asked to do was to consider the potential ways that dioxin could have been released from the site, right?"

That was their assignment, both of them.

Now, I imagine some of you came to this case thinking, you know, "Look, this case is brought by the County, right? So they're going to fully evaluate all the evidence and fairly present it to us, good, bad, however it comes out," they're going to give you the fair story of everything. That's not what happened here.

Sadly, unfortunately, that's not what happened here because the County's own lawyers concealed from these experts that they hired the information that they had about dredging, that they knew that dredging

occurred into the site and released dioxin into the 1 This is Exhibit 25. It's from Mr. Rock Owens. 2 He's one of the attorneys for the County here. 3 In 2009, he acknowledged that "It looks 4 like a large portion of one of the cells," and he's 5 talking about this site, "was dredged away." He knew 6 7 that as of 2009, just like the fellow from the Parks & 8 Wildlife Department knew back in 2006. 9 The County's experts then, who they hired, 10 Bedient and Pardue, told you that all of the information 11 that they got in this case came from lawyers. I mean, 12 that's kind of odd, isn't it, that they didn't even talk to anybody from the County, itself, like the Parks & 13 Wildlife or, you know, anybody from the Pollution 14 Control department? 15 16 All of the information that these two 17 folks, these two experts who came in to testify, came 18 from lawyers, including Mr. Wotring and Mr. Owens. 19 There's Bedient who tells you that. Here's Pardue: 20 "QUESTION: And the positions that Harris 21 County is taking in this case you learned from the 22 lawyers, the outside lawyers, right, in conversations

24 "ANSWER: Yeah, those and with some 25 involvement from the Harris County attorneys, as well,

with them?

23

1 yes. "QUESTION: Which Harris County attorneys?" 2 3 And he tells you who, Mr. Owens and Mr. Wotring. 4 5 Now, you would think in one of those conversations somebody would have said to them, "Hey, 6 7 while you're looking at potential ways that dioxin got 8 out of this site, we ought to look into this dredging issue we know about. Somebody dredged into the site, pulled it out and sent it back into the river." Maybe 10 11 in one of those conversations that would have come up. 12 They never mentioned it to their own It didn't. 13 experts. 14 This is Bedient who testified: 15 "QUESTION: And when you prepared your 16 opinions in this case, am I correct that you did not know that there was dredging into the impoundment?" 17 18 He says, "That's correct." 19 And he comes in here and testifies in this 20 trial, "I've not analyzed anything to do with dredging." 21 I mean, how can you give Bedient any 22 credibility when he tells you, "I have not even looked 23 at that issue?" 24 This is Pardue: "Let me ask this: The one 25 thing that you did not consider as a potential cause of

```
release of dioxin was dredging activities by third
1
   parties directly into the impoundments, themselves,
2
3
   right?
4
                 "ANSWER: At the time of my report, that's
   correct, I did not have any information on dredging."
5
                 The County wanted to put blinders on these
6
7
   experts so they didn't even think about this issue; and
8
   the reason why -- the reason why they asked them "Don't
   even look at that, don't even think about it," is
10
   because the County knew that neither Champion nor IP had
11
   anything to do with that dredging activity.
12
                 This is testimony from their own witness,
   Bedient, here at trial:
13
14
                 "QUESTION: Well, what if somebody dredged
   into the site and actually scooped out material from the
15
   site, that would certainly cause material to escape from
16
   the site, correct?
17
18
                 "ANSWER: If they did that, yes.
19
                 "QUESTION: Absolutely. And you haven't
20
   examined that on behalf of Harris County, right?
21
                 "ANSWER:
                           That is correct.
22
                 "QUESTION: Okay. That's because none of
23
   the parties that are defendants in this case did the
24
   dredging, right?
25
                 "ANSWER:
                           Right."
```

He didn't look at that issue because it didn't support their attempt to get penalties against Champion and IP in this case. That's not right.

Just so there's no doubt about it, I want this to be perfectly clear, the County admits that there is no information that Champion or IP had anything to do with that dredging activity. As a matter of fact, there's no information that Champion or IP ever even knew that that dredging activity was occurring.

The County never came and told us about it. The one party in this courtroom that knew that that dredging activity was occurring and did nothing about it was the County. You saw all those documents where they got notice of all that dredging activity. It went to the County, and they didn't do anything about it. Yet, they're in here saying we should be penalized because we didn't do anything about it, even though we didn't even know about it?

So after ignoring the issue of the dredging activity had occurred at the site, the County wants you to say, "Oh, forget about that because we know at some point part of the site became inundated." And I want to talk to you about that issue briefly.

We know when this site was constructed,
Champion knows from documents, because, again, we didn't

build the site, didn't own the site; but we know from documents that when it was constructed, it was constructed above the level of the river. And if you look at the photograph from early on, there is some land that exists around that site.

What happened over time, over the years and decades that followed, were two things. One is dredging activity began to occur in the river, itself; and I'm talking about right into the impoundment. That came later. But dredging activity began in the river, itself, where -- where millions of cubic yards of sand were pulled out from the river around this site.

And what happened? That caused the course of the river to change and become closer to the site, itself. That wasn't the way it existed originally.

And, again, the County knew about that, knew that was going on.

The second thing that happened was subsidence, and you've heard about this. This area was being developed, as industries do around here. They began pulling the groundwater that's very deep below the surface out for use; and over time, what happens when you pull that lower groundwater out, the earth subsides. And this site here (indicating) was affected by that, and it lowered and it became lower than the river.

The County's own experts admit, as they 1 2 have to admit, that Champion and IP did not cause that 3 subsidence to occur. That's not something that we caused. 4 This is Pardue: 5 "QUESTION: Okay. And the one thing you do 6 7 know about subsidence is that the defendants are not 8 responsible for causing that subsidence, right?" 9 And he says, "Not for causing the 10 subsidence, that's correct." 11 Bedient says the same thing: 12 "QUESTION: Now, the defendants are not 13 responsible for the fact that groundwater was being sucked out at a rate that dropped this impoundment down 14 or caused it to lower, correct?" 15 16 He agrees, "That's correct." 17 You heard about this issue of due 18 I just want to remind you of the timeline. diligence. 19 The County claims that this site subsided by 1989. 20 Remember from Dr. Meyer that Champion had sold its mill 21 in 1987, two years before that happened, and then 22 13 years later is when International Paper first was involved as part of Champion with that merger. 23 24 "Was it Champion/IP that caused, suffered,

permitted or allowed a release of dioxin?"

The answer to that question is "No" from the County's own witnesses.

We weren't responsible for the dredging activity that occurred out there. The County knew about it, didn't do anything to stop it, weren't responsible for subsidence that occurred out at this site. That's not something that Champion or IP had anything to do with. And, frankly, that should be the end of the inquiry as far as Champion or IP are concerned.

There's one other thing I do want to talk to you about, though, because we spent a lot of time on it in this trial; and that is, did the County prove to you that there was a daily release of dioxin from this site? Now, the County's theory is that any time this waste material comes into contact with water, it's going to break apart and float away into the water. That's how they come up with their theory for a daily discharge, but the facts and the evidence that you've heard in this case do not support that.

Now let me talk to you about the County's theory in this case and what's wrong with it. First of all, as I talked to you about, they didn't even consider dredging activity. They incorrectly, in their opinions, assumed that that eastern impoundment was filled with waste material. It wasn't. We'll talk about that.

They mischaracterized and continue today to still mischaracterize this material as being cardboard. They did no fingerprinting anywhere, even though that's an accepted scientific technique. They can't tell you any concentration of dioxin in this river that came from our site, and ultimately they admit that it's impossible to prove what they're asking you to find that there was a daily release.

Now, let me start with the issue of the de-watering process. You remember Dr. Pardue came in early in this case and told you that all three sections of the impoundment were filled with waste material and he said he had done a calculation and that's the only way that you could have filled that site because you needed all that space to fill it.

And that was important to him because he then said -- remember that breach that exists in 1973 in that eastern section? He said that's important because now that means that eastern section is in contact with the water every day from 1973. All right. That was his -- that was his theory.

We now know that -- that what he testified to was just not correct. He completely ignored the fact that this material, when it was placed into the site, was dewatered. It was placed into the western portion;

and the eastern portion of that site was used to de-water, to move the water, which was then taken away by barge. So his calculation failed to account for that fact.

Doctor -- Mr. Zoch explained this, and he said, "Well, how is it that Pardue got this wrong?" He said he just had forgotten or didn't acknowledge the fact that that's the way that this system was set up. So, again, you may say, "Well, I don't know who to believe." You know, you have Pardue on one side saying one thing and Zoch on the other side saying another thing. Just go back and look at the documents.

I mean, this is from a State Department of Health memo -- excuse me -- from 1966 which describes exactly the way that it works, the way that Mr. Zoch told us it works; and there's even a drawing on the back. And this is, again, 1966, at the time it's happening, that shows you the way that it worked and that this area over here (indicating), the eastern section was for de-watering and the waste material was placed only in the western and central part and that when this breach occurred here in 1973 in that eastern corner of the section, it was not in contact with waste material every day because it wasn't even put there.

The de-watering process is important for

```
another issue other than this, too; and that is what did
1
   it do to the waste material, itself? What effect did
2
3
   that de-watering process have on the waste material,
   itself?
4
5
                 The County's lawyer has said since the
   beginning of this case, since opening statements, tried
6
7
   to tell you this material is like cardboard. You heard
8
   it even again today, "It's like cardboard, cheap
9
   cardboard. You put it in water, and it's just going to
   break apart and float away." That is just factually
10
11
   wrong. It's factually incorrect.
12
                 Again, this comes from their own expert.
13
   This is Pardue:
14
                 "QUESTION: And you agree with respect to
   that waste material that is out there that the test
15
   results show that it has a very low permeability,
16
   right?"
17
18
                 He says: "Yes," that's right.
19
                 "QUESTION: The material, the waste
20
   material that we're talking about here in terms of its
   permeability to water, it's not -- it's not cardboard,
21
   right?"
22
23
                 He says: "Perhaps cardboard that has been
24
   smashed into -- into a very tight layer."
```

A very tight layer, indeed. This is

actually the material Mr. Zoch described that existed at this site after it was dewatered. And he tells us, "Well, it may have looked like cardboard in the sense that it had that characteristic; but in terms of" -- it "says nothing about the physical characteristics of the material that we've discussed here already, because cardboard is basically organic material. It's just fibrous. It doesn't have a lot of these solids in it, these inorganics, water insoluble material. So this was not cardboard. It had very different characteristics of cardboard."

What does that mean? It means that the material is impermeable to water, as Mr. Zoch described. If you cut it, it would stand like a brick. And as Dr. Johns told us, because of this de-watering process, once this material was placed in the impoundment and dewatered, it became a very solid mass.

And, again, who should you believe,
Dr. Johns or the experts for the County? What Dr. Johns
described was exactly what the State Department of
Health described back in 1966, where it says in a memo,
and you have this as one of your exhibits, the material
will solidify rapidly. It can be cut so that it stands
like a wall; and after a short period of time, water
will not penetrate it.

And that was what was described in 1966, and Dr. Johns said "That's consistent with my own testimony and experience about how this works."

So what does that mean? I spent a lot of time talking about that material. What does that mean for purposes of this case? Why is it important?

It means that the material has to be moved by some external force. This is -- this is their own witness again, Bedient: "It won't just mix with water, as we said, right?"

And he says: "That's correct. For the sludge, that's correct."

"All right. It has to be moved by some external force, right?"

"ANSWER: Yes."

Mr. Zoch told you it would take some very heavy earth-moving or jetting equipment to move this material, once it was dewatered and put into this site. Like this (indicating). This is what happened in this case. This material was put into the site. It became a solid mass, like everyone, including the State Department of Health, said; but eventually, beginning in the mid-1990s, someone cut into the material, dredged down, broke it apart, mixed it up in the water, moved it over to the site next door, and released it back into

the river. And that was done with the County's 1 2 knowledge. The County says, "But still, you know, once 3 it gets inundated, or at least part of the site becomes 4 inundated, isn't -- isn't the material just going to 5 float off into the water?" 6 7 No. As Mr. Zoch told you, even if it 8 becomes inundated, the action of the currents, the flood 9 waters, or tidal action are not sufficient to cause 10 erosion of this material. 11 And then you heard from Dr. Johns. And, by 12 the way, Dr. Johns, I didn't post his resume up here, but you'll remember he's a Ph.D. from Texas A & M. He's 13 14 been an environmental scientist for 30 years. He is the one person who has actually worked on dozens of sites, 15 16 remediating issues involving dioxin. 17 He said -- and he looked at all the data in 18 this case, and he was asked: 19 "Based on your review of the data in this 20 case, do you believe that the testimony given by 21 Dr. Bedient and Pardue that dioxin was dissolving every 22 day into the river from this site is scientifically 23 supported? 24 "ANSWER: Absolutely not."

And why not? He told us that dioxin is a

very unique chemical. It's one of the most hydrophobic chemicals known to man -- you heard that also from Bedient and Pardue -- which means that when it's attached, when it's attached to material, like to solids that were placed in here, it doesn't want to go out into water. Its natural tendency is to cling to that material and not float off into water, as Dr. Bedient and Pardue testified.

Now, you heard -- you heard in closing that, "Well, we know the material left the site because it's not there anymore." There is no evidence for that. There is zero evidence presented by the County that the material, other than where it was dredged out, that the material that was placed in this site has left in any way.

As a matter of fact, in 2010 and 2011, 44 to 45 years after the material was place into this site, years after the site -- part of the site had become inundated, or partly inundated with water, there were core samples taken as part of the remediation process; and they found that the material was exactly where MIMC had placed it and it had remained there for 45 years.

I want to spend some time on this because he says, well, the material from the central impoundment is gone. No.

"QUESTION: Then how about in the -- the central impoundment, do those core samples reveal that there was -- the waste material still remained there?

"ANSWER: That's correct also.

"And those samples were taken almost 50 years after the material was deposited there?"

"Yeah. 45 years after."

As Dr. Johns told you, if -- what Pardue and Bedient testified to about there being a daily release of dioxin from this site, you would see it. I mean, science would be able to tell you that that's what's happening. You would see a halo, like out from the sun, and you would be able to fingerprint it. And you could say, "I can see it's leaving the site every day," and we could fingerprint it and the concentrations would be highest where it started and it would gradually decrease as it goes away. That doesn't exist here.

As we showed you, the fingerprinting, that was done not by the County's expert because they didn't want to know the answer to that question, but by the people actually doing the remediation on the site, shows that that's just not happening.

So, you know, you may think, "Well, this fingerprinting that we heard about, is that really science? You know, is that good science?" Pardue

admits that it is. He says: 1 "You agree that it's possible for someone 2 3 to do something called fingerprinting of dioxin, right?" "Yes." 4 "And that's an accepted scientific 5 technology, right?" 6 7 "ANSWER: It's accepted, yes." 8 But he didn't do it. 9 "But you've done no fingerprinting of dioxin in this case to determine -- to trace it back to 10 its source in the San Jacinto River, right?" 11 12 "No." 13 Fortunately, it was done; and Dr. Johns 14 looked at it and he told you what it showed. And it 15 doesn't support their theory. 16 Now, they want you to believe that there was a release of dioxin every day from this site. They 17 18 can't tell you how much. We asked them, "Well, if 19 that's happening, how much was released?" "I don't know." 20 21 "Okay. Can you tell us any concentration 22 anywhere in the river at any point in time?" 23 "No, I can't tell you that either." 24 This is Bedient. Again, they're asking us 25 for penalties against us every day based on this theory.

## This is Bedient:

"And you cannot, Dr. Bedient, tell this jury that on any specific location on that map of the river that there is -- that there is a concentrated amount of dioxin that came out from this impoundment, correct?"

"ANSWER: Not a specific value in the river associated with -- no."

They can't point to you a single place in the river where there is dioxin that came from this impoundment. The only people that have presented that evidence to you are Champion and IP through Dr. Johns, who told you exactly where it is and how it got there.

You've seen this. This is one of the maps that the County's lawyer showed on his opening statement with various places where dioxin is found or they tested. They can't tell you that any of this came from the impoundment because it didn't. It came from other places that everybody recognizes.

Before the County asks that you penalize these two companies, not just for one day but for every single day for 35 years, they have to come in with evidence that there was a violation that occurred every single day for 35 years; and their own witnesses admit that they cannot do that.

Remember this with Bedient. We just picked 1 2 a day with him and said, "Let's take May 8, 1977, was there a release of waste material from the site into the 3 river?" 4 5 His answer, "Don't have specific information on that day." 6 7 "And if I asked you the same question about 8 any specific day between 1973 and 2008," that's their 9 penalty period, "would you give me the same answer?" "Yes." 10 11 I went through the same line of questions 12 with Pardue, picked a different date. He said the same 13 thing. 14 They're asking for penalties. In some cases they're asking you for \$25,000 a day in penalties 15 against a company, and they can't tell you that this 16 happened on any particular day. The most that they tell 17 18 you is that there was a potential. 19 This is Bedient: "Just to be clear, you 20 can't say there was a release from these pits -- all three pits on any given day, correct?" 21 "ANSWER: That's a correct statement." 22 What he says is: "You think there are 23 24 mechanisms that allow it to happen, but you can't say

any amount that actually came out on any given day,

correct?"

2 "ANSWER: Not the amount, no."

If he can't tell you whether it happened on any particular day, he can't tell you the amount, he cannot tell you where it is or where it went, they haven't met their burden of proving that there was a violation that entitles them to penalties every day for 35 years.

The bottom line here is that this material was placed by MIMC at this site back in 1965 and 1966 and, except where it was dredged out, it remains exactly where it was put. Some of it now has subsided and is underwater, and you've heard there is a process now going on to remediate the site. But other than where it was dredged out, it remains exactly where it was put 35 or now 45, 50 years ago. The answer to the question of whether the County has proven a daily release is no.

Mr. Carter is going to address a couple of other issues for us and wrap things up. Again, it's been my privilege to try this case in front of you.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Mr. Carter.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

FURTHER CLOSING ARGUMENT

BY MR. CARTER:

The evidence is overwhelming. This is not

-- this is not even a close call. That is the reason I

have the confidence and Dave has the confidence to stand

before you against the power of the government and -- to

stand before you and to say we did nothing wrong because

the evidence that we just went through proves it.

This case is not and you should not be concerned about -- about it being a part of the environment. This will not be a case in which Harris County is bringing people who have personal injuries or property damage. That's what the County told you, and they have not brought anybody here. That's not a concern about this case, and they admit that.

There has been no money being sought for remediation or cleanup. Judge Baker read to you on the first day, and this is from the stipulation by all parties: "Since 2008 the EPA has been overseeing the environmental investigation that's been being performed or paid for by the Defendants as required by federal law. If any penalty payments are assessed in this lawsuit," which I -- obviously I believe they should not be, "the money will not be going for any ongoing site remediation or any ultimate cleanup here."

That's what Judge Baker told you. The penalties are going to go into the State's general fund,

so that somebody can figure out, "Well, what -- what project am I going to put the money to," or Harris County's general fund and "What -- what am I going to do with it"; but it's not going to go to cleanup.

The other thing Judge Baker said, and this is also from the Court's instruction read to you the first day, that participating in the Superfund process, which is what we're doing as a company, participating in the Superfund process has no bearing on whether a party is liable under the Texas statutes claimed in this lawsuit.

So the fact that we're participating in the Superfund process to do what we are doing, Harris County isn't doing it -- what we're doing is cleaning this site up. They're not doing it. And that is no reason to assess penalties against us under the Texas statutes being claimed here.

So this case is not about the environmental cleanup. It's not about personal injury, and it's not about harm to personal property. This is a case about money for the contingency fee lawyers, and we'll get to that in a minute, the money I just mentioned about going to the general fund, and for punishing -- punishing an innocent party who is not responsible. And the evidence we've brought to you, in fact the evidence from their

own experts that we've brought to you, reflects that we're innocent of the charges being brought against us.

Before this case even got going, Bob Zoch, who had been retained in the past by Connelly Baker, the law firm here, he said and he testified to you that he had been retained and used by them, a trusted expert for the County, for the County's lawyers, and he told you that, "Yeah, I have worked for them before. Then I received a call from Mr. Connelly, yes, sir; but after I read the pleadings, read the lawsuit, what the case was about, I pretty much decided that I would not work on that project on behalf of the Plaintiffs."

In other words, Bob Zoch gets a call from Harris County's lawyers for this case. He looked at it and says, "Hu-huh, I can't work on this case for you. I don't believe in it."

We know this case is about the lawyers because pollution control -- and Mr. Allen is sitting over here, and he testified in the case. But we brought to you his deposition testimony in our case. You didn't hear it from the County.

What does he say? He says that even the Harris County agency responsible for pollution control did not bring this lawsuit.

"What did you say, that this is not a

pollution control suit?" 1 "Correct." 2 3 "So you no longer have control over the case or the penalty being assessed?" 4 "Correct." 5 We heard the description about the lawyers: 6 7 I don't want to hear anything about -- I don't want to 8 see anything about dredging. I don't want to hear about 9 the dredging. 10 "The information that you've gotten about 11 Harris County's positions in this case have all come 12 from the outside lawyers for Harris County, right?" 13 Is that the way experts, experts, are 14 supposed to come to you? Is that the way the County is supposed to treat transparency? Is that transparent? 15 16 Pardue: "On those topics on which you've been designated..." 17 18 "In discussions with counsel, we went over 19 the reports that are being relied on by Harris County 20 for those positions and -- and that's what I'm prepared 21 to discuss today." 22 The lawyers are talking. We heard the lawyer get on the stand from the Connelly Baker firm and 23 testify about all of their fees, fees of which they told 24

you just a minute ago that they haven't been paid.

Well, they have been, by MIMC. 1 "So out of that 46, roughly, million 2 3 dollars, how much of that do you personally stand to gain..." "Several million dollars?" 4 "I suspect so." 5 But they can't tell you how much is -- goes 6 7 to the case against International Paper. 8 "And sitting here today, you can't tell me 9 how much work, for example, was billed by the hour for any particular defendant in this case?" 10 11 "We didn't separate it out per defendant. 12 So it's not -- so I don't know if we can. We haven't 13 done it. It's not occurred to me to do it, to segregate the fees out." 14 15 "So it's not something that you undertook in giving your opinions in this case?" 16 17 "That's correct." 18 They have no evidence of their attorney's 19 fees, although we do know that they, indeed, have been 20 paid now by MIMC. 21 Is this case about protecting the 22 environment? No. Is this case about the lawyers? Yes. 23 Does the County deserve any money from IP? No. 24 And you've heard the evidence. The County, 25 itself, designed and approved the site. We've heard

testimony about that from all of their experts. 1 Pardue -- Ford: 2 "You don't have any fault with the 3 contractor going to Quebedeaux and seeking his approval 4 for the site selection or seeking his approval for the 5 disposal operation process?" 6 7 "No, I don't have no problem with that. 8 They should have gone to him." 9 Allen, he testifies that's what the parties should have done here, they should have sought his 10 approval. That is what we did. 11 12 The County -- Dr. Quebedeaux says in his opening remarks, "Well, I was originally involved with 13 14 the original contractor to design the pits." 15 "And Harris County does not have any 16 different information about that, right?" 17 "No, we don't." 18 This is all testimony from the County. 19 This isn't our witnesses. This is the County's 20 witnesses. 21 The County knew about the dredging and did 22 nothing to stop it. We have Allen, public notices went to the County. He talked about that. 1996, when they 23 got the first notice, until 2009 when dredging finally 24 25 stopped, did nothing.

"Dredging around the site was done with the knowledge of Harris County and without objection, correct?"

"Correct."

"Did Harris County ever do anything to try and stop the dredging in and around the site from '70 to 2009?"

"Not to my knowledge."

Question One of the Charge, "Do you find that any of the Defendants caused, suffered, allowed, or permitted..."

You have to go to the language on Page 6 of your Charge where "cause, suffer, allow or permit" is defined. It has the common meaning. We're talking about the first release that's being claimed, 1973, did we cause, suffer, allow or permit a discharge in 1973, when we were off the property in 1966.

"A person 'causes, suffers, allows, or permits' an event when that person had the power to prevent an event at the time of the event, but failed to do so." We did not have the power to prevent an event. That goes to Question One.

So the answer to these two questions -- or this question for both Champion and IP is "No"; and that's based upon the overwhelming evidence from the

| County's witnesses, themselves.

Here is the instruction from the Court that was pulled out about power to prevent. And this case is not about the disposal, itself. We've talked about that. That's from the opening statement of the County's own lawyer.

And this question is about disposal: "Do you find any of the following Defendants caused, suffered, allowed, or permitted the handling or disposal of solid waste containing dioxin?"

The same -- the same instructions on Page
-- on Page 12, it's Question Number Four, the same
definition for "cause, suffer and allow," did we have
the power to prevent an event. And this is from
December 31, 1975, until March 30, 2008. This begins in
'75. That is almost 10 years after the disposal was
done by MIMC. The answer to that is "No."

Remember, on Page 12 and on Page 6 to both of these questions it says generation of -- waste generation is not enough, contract with a disposal company is not enough, and the contract ended in 1966. So the answer to this question, Question Number Four, is both "No."

Now, if you look back to Page 6, just to give you a little help, that's Question Number One, and

if you go to Question Number Two, which is Page 7, you'll see at the top, if you answered yes to Question One, you answer Question Two. But then it says, "Otherwise, do not answer the following question." if you answer "No" to Question One, then you don't have to answer Question Number Two, you don't have to answer Question Number Three, you don't have to answer -- well, then you get to Question Number Four, which is the second -- for the second statute. So that's the disposal statute.

If you answer that question "No," then Question Number Five you don't have to answer, Question Six you don't have to answer -- that's the one about them trying to get their attorney's fees -- Question Eight you don't have to answer, Question Nine you don't have to answer, Question Ten you don't have to answer, and Questions Eleven and Twelve you don't have to answer.

So if you answer Question One "No" and you answer Question Four "No," then you don't have to answer any of the other questions.

So is there any reason to punish IP? Did we do anything wrong? No. We're not responsible for maintaining the site. We didn't cause, suffer and allow a release of dioxin. The County didn't prove their

case. It's not about protecting the environment. They don't deserve any money.

This is the last time -- and I appreciate your attention, and I appreciate you following along with me. I know it's a lot of information in a short period of time. This is the last time I will be able to talk to you until after your verdict, when I'll hopefully have the opportunity to personally come before you and say thank you for your service.

You are going to get a chance to hear from the County again; and during that time, since I'm not going to be able to talk to you again, but during that time I challenge you to listen carefully and when he gets up and he says something and you kind of have to turn your head and say, "Well, is that right? What would Carter say? What would Carter say in response to that?"

You have to test it. You have to test it with the evidence, "What would Schrader say?" Think about it as he comes back, because I don't get another opportunity here.

Thank you very much for your time. On behalf of Karen Edwards and International Paper, I appreciate everything that you've done. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

Mr. Wotring. 1 Can I have a brief break? 2 MR. WOTRING: 3 THE COURT: Yes. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll have a brief 4 break and then finish up with closing argument. 5 MR. WOTRING: Your Honor, I have a couple 6 7 of matters I would like to take up. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 (Whereupon, the jury left the courtroom and 10 the following proceedings were had outside the presence 11 of the jury:) 12 THE COURT: Please be seated. 13 MR. WOTRING: Your Honor, we are outside 14 the presence of the jury and at this time Harris County would ask for the opportunity to reopen the evidence and 15 16 submit the UAO and the TCRA memo in response to the argument by counsel for International Paper that Harris 17 18 County did not fairly evaluate the evidence before 19 bringing this lawsuit. They opened the door. violated the Court's motion in limine. 20 21 At this time Harris County would request 22 the opportunity to put those documents into evidence. I'll read them to the jury and respond to that 23 24 inappropriate closing argument by counsel. 25 There was one other point after we address

```
That has to do with counsel for
1
   that point.
2
   International Paper also informed the jury, contrary to,
3
   I believe, the Court's previous instructions, that
   because the instruction came from the Judge, "power to
4
   prevent" meant the legal power to prevent. I think we
5
   discussed that prior to closing, and the Court
6
7
   instructed us that that was not the argument that could
8
   be made.
             Those are the two issues.
9
                 MR. SCHRADER: On the fairly evaluate the
   evidence, that was about Dr. Pardue and Dr. Bedient not
10
11
   considering dredging. That was after the lawsuit was
12
   filed.
           The comment wasn't in bringing the lawsuit.
                                                         Ιt
13
   was in presenting the evidence to the jury.
14
                 THE COURT:
                             Do you want to address the
   other issue?
15
16
                 MR. WOTRING: Your Honor, in response to
   that, I think the comment was that "You would think
17
18
   that" -- words to the effect, "You would think Harris
19
   County would have fairly evaluated the evidence before
20
   bringing this lawsuit" and it was not about the experts
21
   Pardue and Bedient. The other comment was --
22
                 THE COURT: Just a moment. We will pull
23
   that portion up and look at it. The other issue has to
   do with the --
24
```

MR. WOTRING: Argument by Mr. Carter that

because the instruction came from the Judge, the power 1 2 to prevent meant the legal power to prevent. I think 3 this Court gave us an instruction that that argument could not be made. 4 Well, I didn't make that 5 MR. CARTER: I said what it was. I read it, "power to 6 argument. 7 prevent," and I said I thought that's what it meant. 8 MR. WOTRING: No. 9 THE COURT: We will look that one up, as 10 well. So let's take a quick break to do that. 11 we'll proceed with rebuttal. Let's go off the record. 12 (Whereupon, after a break, the following 13 proceedings were had outside the presence of the jury:) 14 THE COURT: Please be seated. 15 MR. WOTRING: Your Honor, with respect to 16 the first issue brought up by the Defendants' closing argument, that is, their statement on the record which 17 18 is marked as Page 45, specifically the quote "But 19 regarding the power to prevent, the power to prevent --20 and when Judge Baker read you the instruction, and we're 21 going to go through this in a minute, the power to 22 prevent, 'cause, suffer, allow or permit' requires the 23 power. What power would that be coming from a judge? 24 It must be the legal power to prevent."

That quote, Harris County would request an

instruction reading that "Prior to closing arguments, counsel were instructed that they could not argue that the phrase 'power to prevent' meant the legal power to prevent. Counsel for International Paper violated this Court's instruction and made the argument that "the power to prevent" in the Court's Charge meant the legal power to prevent; and I am instructing you that the instruction in the Charge regarding 'cause, suffer, allow, or permit,' including the power to prevent an event, is not limited to the legal power to prevent the event."

MR. STANFIELD: Your Honor, I will be representing Mr. Carter and Mr. Schrader in this proceeding. Your Charge is quite clear, and we assume the juries follow the instructions of the Court.

Instruction No. 4 states, "If my instructions use a word -- if they use a word in a way that is different from its ordinary meaning, use the meaning I give you, which will be a proper legal definition."

You have not gone on to define it. We assume juries will follow this instruction and say "I am going to assume that because I did not get another instruction from the Court, there is no special definition."

I do not remember you instructing Mr. Carter or anyone that we cannot argue what we thought was necessary under the evidence to hold us liable. The jury has heard your instruction. The jury has heard your Charge; and I think what you said earlier, if you are going to say anything, would be what the proper thing is to say, which is "I have given you the instructions. You are to follow my instructions in the Charge," period.

Asking for the kind of instruction the County asked for is wholly improper. And we would point out that earlier in this trial, when two of your limine rulings were blatantly violated about claiming a health threat in the groundwater and then using the Highway 90 gauge data, the Court showed restraint and did not give a similar instruction; and it's certainly not warranted here.

THE COURT: It seems to me the appropriate thing to do would be to give an instruction, and I want to think about exactly how to word this, but that explains to the jury that "The Court has given you the Charge, which is the law of the case that you're to follow." And I don't mind saying in that instruction that the portion that references "the power to prevent" does not contain the word "legal" or something to that

effect.

MR. STANFIELD: He can argue that, too.

THE COURT: He can.

MR. CARTER: He can also argue that it's a moral power or a higher power or any other power. There is nothing to refrain him from arguing whatever "power" means, so whatever he wants to attach to "power." I attached legal power because we were talking about the contract, the contract being a legal document. That is what I was referring to, not the fact that you were saying it meant legal power.

But the fact is this is all about legal power. It's not about a higher power. So he can very well argue whatever he wants to argue as to what "the power" means or what it doesn't mean. That is just the way you argue cases.

MR. WOTRING: I appreciate the instruction on how to argue a case. It's useful. But more to the point, and with a little bit less levity because of the seriousness of the situation, Harris County is formally requesting, quote, "The instruction in the Charge regarding 'cause, suffer, allow or permit,' including the power to prevent an event, is not limited to the legal power to prevent the event," or however the Court may deem appropriate to clarify that particular issue.

```
MR. STANFIELD: That would be an amendment
1
   to the Charge, and we would object to that amendment to
2
3
                We've already had our formal Charge
   the Charge.
   Conference. The Charge has been read to the jury.
4
   is what it is; and the Court should properly tell the
5
   jury, if anything, "I've given you the Charge and the
6
7
   instructions. You are to follow my instructions."
8
                 THE COURT: This is what I am going to do:
9
   I will give the jury an instruction that the Charge that
10
   is being submitted to them contains the law of the case.
   Then I will reread for them that definition and tell
11
12
   them, "Here are the words of the definition that you are
13
   to follow"; and I'll re-read that entire definition,
14
   which includes "the power to prevent."
                 MR. WOTRING: Will the Court also mention
15
   it does not contain the word "legal"?
16
17
                 THE COURT:
                             I think by me re-reading it --
18
   I'm going to say this is exactly what it says and this
19
   is only thing it says.
20
                 MR. WOTRING:
                               Okay.
21
                 MR. GEORGE: I'll just note I think the
22
   second sentence, "the person causes, suffers," is an
23
   instruction, technically.
                 THE COURT: That's fair. That's an
24
25
   instruction.
```

MR. WOTRING: And Harris County has two 1 2 other issues regarding the closing argument. 3 THE COURT: Just a moment, just so I'm clear. I think probably the appropriate thing for me to 4 do is just read that sentence that's the instruction, 5 since that's the one we're talking about, "a person 6 causes, suffers, allows." 7 8 MR. CARTER: That's fine. 9 MR. WOTRING: That's fine, yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: I'll do that. 10 11 MR. WOTRING: Two other issues. Page 65 of 12 the transcript, I understand that's provisional, but here is the quote: "Now, I imagine some of you came to 13 this case thinking, you know, look, this case is brought 14 by the County, right, so they're going to fully evaluate 15 16 all the evidence and fairly present it to us, good, bad, however it comes out, they're going to give you the fair 17 18 story of everything. That's not what happened here," 19 end quote. 20 Harris County at this point requests again 21 that this Court permit us to introduce into evidence the Exhibit No. 453 and Exhibit No. 119. Exhibit 119 is the 22 Unilateral Administrative Order for Remedial 23 24 Investigation/Feasibility Study. Exhibit No. 453 is the decision document for the Time Critical Removal Action. 25

To respond to this argument that Harris 1 2 County did not fully evaluate all of the evidence, in 3 response to argument by counsel, if the Court will remember, counsel for defendant argued that the 4 admission of these two documents alone would be so 5 prejudicial to their interest, they would not be able to 6 7 receive a fair jury trial if they were presented to the 8 jury. They then stand up in closing argument and argue that Harris County didn't fully evaluate all the 10 evidence, suggesting that there was something 11 inappropriate about Harris County bringing this case. 12 And Harris County -- the only fair response is for us to 13 be able to introduce this evidence to the jury and have 14 them consider it. If anything, a limiting instruction that this is what Harris County reviewed prior to 15 bringing the lawsuit. 16 17 MR. SCHRADER: Mr. Wotring ought to 18 apologize because he represented to you that I said that

MR. SCHRADER: Mr. Wotring ought to apologize because he represented to you that I said that they didn't fully evaluate the case before, quote, "bringing this lawsuit." I didn't think I said that. In fact, the transcript reflects that I did not say that.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This was a discussion about the fact that their experts did not consider dredging. And I said, "Before presenting the facts to the jury, you'd think

they would have presented all the facts, even the bad facts; and they didn't because they didn't talk about dredging." I didn't say what he represented to this Court that I said about before filing the lawsuit.

This is perfectly appropriate argument that happens in every case, where you say they didn't give you the bad side of the story for them, specifically about dredging. That was the entire context of this discussion.

THE COURT: When you consider everything that was said in the closing argument -- it would be one thing if Mr. Schrader had left it open; but he was very specific when he then proceeded to identify what it is he thinks Harris County did not fully evaluate and what he thinks they didn't allow their experts to fully evaluate. And that was the dredging information, and that was the focus of that argument.

He was critical of the fact that

Drs. Bedient and Pardue didn't review the dredging
information or it wasn't given to them, and that was the
point he was making. If he had left it open and
suggested something else Harris County didn't evaluate
or didn't present, that would be one thing; but the
focus of that argument clearly was about the fact that
he believed -- and the way he argued it to the jury was

"They didn't provide to the experts the information about dredging, and that's because it wasn't good for them." I mean, that's the argument they were making, quote/unquote.

So with that, I must deny Harris County's request. I don't think that opens the door on that issue.

MR. WOTRING: One further matter for the Court's consideration. On Page 88 of the provisional transcript, the argument was made, "So the fact that we're participating in the Superfund process to do what we're doing, Harris County isn't doing it. What we're doing is cleaning up the site. They're not doing it. And that is no reason to assess penalties against us under the Texas statutes being claimed here," end quote.

Harris County is participating in the Superfund process, and that has been excluded from evidence and from consideration. And this statement by counsel is a violation of our -- I think the Court's motion in limine and our understanding of how we were going to handle the Superfund process. And we need an instruction to cure the prejudice to Harris County's interest, and we can draft that and submit it to the Court for its consideration, as well.

MR. STANFIELD: That is an inaccurate

factual statement in the context of this statement.

What Mr. Carter argued was totally in line with the stipulation, which is that the Defendants are paying for or performing the investigation, removal, and remediation at the site, period. That is what the stipulation says. The stipulation points out that we are paying for the remediation, which is just another word in common parlance for cleanup.

There is nothing in our stipulation to the jury that Harris County is doing that. If Harris County wanted to include something in the stipulation to the jury as part of the record that it was providing comments to documents and things like that, then it could have done that. But Mr. Carter was working within the confines of this stipulation; and now Harris County is trying to come back and add to that stipulation, which was negotiated a month and a half ago at this point.

THE COURT: I think this one is a little trickier because of the first sentence, that "The fact that we're participating in the Superfund process to do what we are doing, Harris County isn't doing it," which I think sort of leaves open the implication that Harris County isn't participating at all. However, I think we also have to be fair not to provide a suggestion that

```
Harris County is paying for cleanup or anything like
1
2
   that because I think that goes beyond what this
3
   addresses.
                 If you want a plain vanilla instruction
4
   that addresses Harris County somehow being involved
5
   without suggesting that they're paying for something, I
6
7
   would be open to that.
8
                 MR. WOTRING:
                               Thank you, Your Honor.
                                                        We
9
   will draft something and submit it for the Court.
10
                 And I'm going to need eat something.
                                                        Where
11
   is the -- is the jury eating?
12
                 THE COURT:
                             Off the record.
13
                 (Whereupon, after a discussion off the
   record, the following proceedings were had:)
14
15
                 THE COURT:
                             Please be seated. Yes, sir.
16
                 MR. WOTRING:
                               Harris County has drafted an
   instruction regarding the issue of its participation in
17
18
   the Superfund process. It's requesting an instruction
             "Counsel for Defendants stated that Harris
19
   County was not participating in the Superfund process.
20
21
   That is not true.
                       Harris County is actively
22
   participating in the Superfund process as a governmental
23
   stakeholder."
24
                 THE COURT: Why don't you respond to the
25
   last part?
```

```
1
                 MR. STANFIELD: Your Honor, the last part,
2
   here is how you can deal with that: "Harris County is
3
   participating in the Superfund process, but is not
   funding any part of that process," period.
4
5
                 MR. WOTRING: That is incorrect.
                                                    Harris
   County is having to fund its participation in the
6
7
   Superfund process for the Superfund site the Defendants
8
   created.
9
                 THE COURT: Well, I think the question is
10
    -- Harris County is not contributing funds to the
11
   remediation process, correct?
12
                 MS. BAKER: It's not been ordered to do so
   like the Defendants have.
13
14
                 THE COURT: I understand, but that is a
   correct factual statement?
15
16
                 MR. WOTRING: That is a correct factual
   statement.
17
18
                 THE COURT: Okay. I'm not saying we should
19
   word it that way, but I think it's perfectly fine to
20
   instruct the jury that -- and I'm happy to say it like
21
   this, not the initial part, but to say that "Ladies and
22
   gentlemen, I need to give you a few instructions to
   clarify some matters." That's what I'm going to say,
23
24
   okay?
25
                 Then I'm happy to give the portion of the
```

instruction that states that Harris County is participating as a governmental stakeholder. I think that's fair because that's accurate. Let's go off the record for a second.

(Whereupon, after a discussion off the record, the jury entered the courtroom and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Ladies and gentlemen, before we proceed with the rebuttal argument, there are a few matters that I need to clarify.

First of all, the Charge that you all have a copy of and that you're going to take back to the jury room for deliberation, you are to consider that the law of the case and follow all the definitions and instructions and the questions in that document. I'm going to read you an instruction from that Charge:

"A person 'causes, suffers, allows, or permits' an event when that person had the power to prevent an event at the time of the event, but failed to do so"; and that is the complete instruction. It says what it says and nothing more.

You are also instructed that Harris County is participating in the Superfund process as a governmental stakeholder. As a government, federal law

does not require Harris County to contribute funds to the investigation, removal, and remediation process.

With that, we will proceed with rebuttal.

Mr. Wotring.

MR. WOTRING: Thank you, Your Honor.

# REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

# MR. WOTRING:

I do have more to discuss with you, and this is important. I'll repeat what I said on one matter, that I don't believe there is any more important deliberation or proceeding going on with regard to how we're going to handle pollution that we generate than what's going on in this courtroom.

I do want to repeat one more thing from Mr. Benedict of the TCEQ who represents the State's interest in this proceeding, that we should not be distracted from that process and these deliberations by distractions that don't go to the Court's Charge.

I think the Court has clarified now that Harris County is participating in the Superfund process, as the Court instructed you. I think the Court has also clarified, and it's Harris County's position, that the instruction regarding the power to stop pollution, as reflected in the Charge from the Court's instruction, does not contain the word "legal power"; and with that

let me move on to more substantive issues that we have in the time remaining to us.

A suggestion has been made that somehow my participation in this, Ms. Baker's participation in this process, is -- makes this outside the Houston pollution control office. I agree. This case is outside Harris County's pollution control office. This case is in the hands of the Harris County Attorney, Mr. Vince Ryan, who is sitting right there. Vince Ryan is elected by the people of Harris County to protect its interests, and that's who is handling this case.

And if the suggestion is to be made in this case that somehow I am or Ms. Baker are operating outside or beyond Vince Ryan's control, Mr. O'Rourke's control, or Mr. Owens' control, that's entirely wrong and it gives me attributes of a personality that I just don't have and it gives Mr. Ryan, as a retired lieutenant colonel in the Army Reserves, who volunteered for Vietnam, attributes he certainly doesn't have. And it's very unfortunate that that type of distraction is brought into these proceedings.

I'm not going to address any more. I want to get back to the evidence, so you-all can get to the work you need to do and the responsibilities you have.

One of those responsibilities is to look at the

evidence. I agree with that.

I wholeheartedly want you to consider all of the evidence very carefully. This case, I think, is simple; but you all have a lot of evidence and a lot of testimony to consider and a fairly complicated Charge.

I think the answers are simple, but there is a lot to consider and a lot of work and a lot of deliberation because this case is that important. And one of the things that has come up in -- that I want to clarify with you is with respect to specific claims about the testimony of Bob Zoch.

If I could pull up Slide 2.

This does get particular. If you'll remember, Pit B is the middle pit; and he told me that Pit B was full with paper mill sludge containing dioxin. He also told me, if you'll remember, that he had not seen the survey until he came and watched testimony at trial.

I'm not going to attribute improper motives to my opponents as they have to me about that fact. He simply failed to consider that survey until he got here. Therefore, his opinions were formed without the benefit of knowing that the site was inundated by the San Jacinto River starting in 1989, and that means his opinions are questionable and should not be relied upon.

He did agree with me that Pit B was filled with waste impoundment. He also agreed with me that dredging only impacted the northwest corner of the site, and he agreed that dredging only took place in 1996 and 1997.

And let me pull up that slide for you. Let me pull up Slide 4. This is Pit B. He agreed that was filled with waste material.

And if we go to Slide 7, Pit B is gone.

It's underwater. It's gone. It's been washed away, and every aerial photograph you see after 1989 reflects that Pit B is underwater and the waste in it is gone. Even Dr. Zoch, who testified that Pit B was filled with waste material. also testified that Pit B is in this area.

And as you can see from the Defendants' own expert's report, that area is underwater. If it was filled with waste material, it would have been even with the western impoundments; and now it is gone because it washed away, contrary to what the Defendants are suggesting. This material is not impervious to the effects of the river or the water, storms, or hurricanes; and it washed away.

The suggestion has also been made, which I want to address with you, that somehow there was not waste material in the eastern impoundments.

If I could pull up Slide 20.

This is the board minutes from 1968. I think we've gone through this. I won't read them in detail. What the board minutes say is they are abandoning the site because it is filled with waste material and they're going to write off its value from \$50,000 to 1.

But what it says here, "Completely filled with waste materials and could no longer serve as a dumpsite." Again, if we go back to Slide 4, the people at the time in August of 1968 said that Pits A, B, and C were completely filled with waste material. If you go to Slide 7, Pits B and C are gone. They're under the water.

Defendants are suggesting that subsidence had something to do with that. The only expert who has talked about the actual amount of subsidence -- and your memory will reflect this probably better than what I'm going to tell you right now because what we hear about juries is after you all absorb the information collectively, and the reason we have juries, is because you have a more accurate memory collectively of the testimony and are a more accurate processor of that information and reach a better decision than one person or several people. That's why we have the jury system

we have.

And your memory will and your notes and the testimony of Dr. Bedient is the amount of subsidence from 1973 on was only half a foot. Subsidence did not cause this. What caused the fact that Pits B and C are gone is that they eroded and washed away.

And there has been no testimony by any of the Defendants' expert about how this cheap grade of cardboard transformed itself into some water-impervious substance that would have -- would have remained intact, despite years of being under the waters of the San Jacinto River.

If we could go to Slide -- just a couple more because I do want you to consider all the evidence and the testimony in this case.

If we could go to Slide 19.

This is the Champion 1966. There is no evidence this was ever shown to Dr. Quebedeaux. There is no evidence -- in fact, the conclusive evidence is that the Defendants did nothing in response to knowing about the pollution problem at the site, they did nothing to investigate, nothing to report, and nothing to follow up. And there is no evidence to suggest they ever informed Dr. Quebedeaux of this fact, as suggested by counsel.

So I enjoin -- or join with the Defendants in their request that you process this information and consider the elements in the Charge thoroughly and completely because that's what this process means and that's what you, as the deliberative body, are required to do under your jury oath.

I just want to touch upon a couple of things that I talked about in the beginning of the day in terms of why we think maximum penalties are appropriate in this case. Of course, you are the ones that have that power to set the appropriate penalty; and if you accept the Defendants' supposition, their idea that they should pay nothing, then that's the kind of due diligence that companies will do when they buy each other. If you accept the idea that Defendants should pay nothing for not one single day of a release, then that's the kind of follow-up and investigation and pollution control that you will be saying is appropriate in a situation like this, based upon the evidence.

If you accept the idea that when companies buy each other, they don't have to do any due diligence to find any of the environmental liabilities associated with them, then that's the type of due diligence that will be done in a case like this; and if you accept the idea that after manufacturing swimming pools full of

sludge laced with dioxin, without any follow-up or any sort of review to make sure that it's not getting out into our environment, then that is what's going to happen not just here, but in other places who are going to be watching the verdict in this case.

And you are the voice of the community and the voice of Harris County in terms of what kind of pollution control you want the people of Harris County to have for its residents and for its citizens. There isn't another body right now deliberating about pollution control that is more important than you-all; and the law in Texas is that you, as the citizens and the members of this jury, have the power to set between the minimum and the maximum the amount of pollution control you think that companies should have, in accordance with the law that was given to you by the Judge.

And if you should be distracted from considering the evidence and the Court's instruction, which is not that you have to prove a release beyond reasonable doubt each and every day, but only based upon a preponderance of the evidence, the law that is given to you by the Court, you should be distracted from that purpose and that task, then we will all suffer because pollution control will be set back. So that is the

responsibility that I'm going to now turn over to you.

I do want to make one further comment about attorney's fees. I can't be more sincere. I do not want attorney's fees to get in the way of you-all reaching the correct decision about civil penalties. We will get paid out of a portion of the penalties you award up to a capped amount, and you heard that testimony. If that is all you think is appropriate -- I have spoken to Ms. Baker -- then that is all you should award in terms of attorney's fees.

We think we have worked hard on this case. We think we deserve to get paid. We think that we will trust you to be the voice of conscience on what would be reasonable and appropriate and live with that, because that's our form of service, just as so many of y'all have served and provided public service.

I don't have anything else. There is dozens of PowerPoint slides I could go through, dozens of pieces of evidence, and probably much more I should be doing to respond to the over 100 PowerPoint slides the Defendants provided to you. What I would ask is that you carefully consider all the evidence and you review the Charge carefully.

There is no hurry. There is no more important deliberative body right now looking at

pollution control in this country than the people who are about to deliberate what is the appropriate civil penalties and what is the appropriate amount of pollution control which should be set for the people of Harris County and our community.

With that, I'll thank you. I hope that we have been been efficient. I trust you all and will be -- it's a weird relationship you have with the jury as a trial attorney. I don't get to talk to you except this one time.

I said at the very beginning I think that I have grown as a person, I have grown as an attorney, I certainly have grown as a member of our community, by coming, speaking, listening to the judgment of juries in Harris County. That has uniformly been the case. It is the greatest privilege and honor I can have to come here and present the case to you.

Thank you for your service. With that, I will sit down and we will await your verdict.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wotring.

Ladies and gentlemen, you now have the Court's Charge, the evidence, and the attorneys' arguments before you. If you'll retire to the jury room and begin deliberating on your verdict.

(Whereupon, the jury left the courtroom and

```
began deliberations and, after a break, the following
1
2
   proceedings were had outside the presence of the jury:)
3
                 THE COURT:
                             Mr. Wotring, you have something
   to withdraw? We are on the record. Mr. Wotring.
4
5
                 MR. WOTRING:
                               Plaintiffs are withdrawing
   Exhibit No. 133.
6
7
                 THE COURT:
                             Mr. Stanfield?
8
                 MR. STANFIELD: Your Honor, Defendants
9
   International Paper and Champion are withdrawing
   Exhibits 1335, 18, 1053, 1225, 1228, 1234, 707, 901.
10
                 THE COURT: And I assume -- off the record.
11
12
                 (Whereupon, after a discussion off the
13
   record, the following proceedings were had:)
14
                             Back on the record.
                 THE COURT:
   the agreement from IP about Harris County's withdrawal
15
   of their exhibit and by Harris County agreeing to the
16
   withdrawal of International Paper's exhibits?
17
18
                 MR. WOTRING: Yes, the ones that counsel
19
   just identified.
20
                 MR. STANFIELD: And, Your Honor, my
21
   understanding is also we have an agreement to withdraw
22
   Exhibit 211. 211-A has already been withdrawn.
                                                     It is
23
   for the Court's purposes. That -- that was Plaintiffs'
24
   Exhibit 211; that Plaintiffs' Exhibit 851 will be
25
   corrected to remove the last two unrelated pages;
```

```
1
   Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1233 will be withdrawn; that
   redactions have been made to Defendants' Exhibit 301 to
2
   redact the phrase "displaying in the south basin";
3
   redactions have been made to Defendants' Exhibit 1147
4
   for the phrase, quote, "old site"; Defendants' 1053 has
5
   been withdrawn; Defendants' 1168 has been redacted for
6
7
   certain dollar amounts; Exhibit 1335, Defendants', has
8
   been withdrawn; and Defendants' Exhibits 19 and 20 have
   been withdrawn for the jury's consideration and are for
10
   Court purposes only.
11
                 THE COURT: Off the record.
12
                 (Whereupon, after a discussion off the
13
   record, the following proceedings were had:)
14
                 THE COURT: We're back on the record.
                                                         0n
   behalf of Harris County, is that your agreement?
15
16
                 MR. MUIR: Yes.
17
                 THE COURT: I am going to ask you a couple
18
   of questions. We're on the record. On behalf of your
19
   client, have you examined all of your exhibits and those
20
   of opposing counsel?
                 Mr. Muir?
21
22
                 MR. MUIR: Yes.
23
                 THE COURT: Mr. Stanfield?
                 MR. STANFIELD:
24
                                 Yes
25
                             Have you confirmed that the
                 THE COURT:
```

```
redactions, if any, have been performed correctly?
1
                 Mr. Muir?
2
                 MR. MUIR:
                           Yes
3
                 THE COURT: Mr. Stanfield?
4
                 MR. STANFIELD:
5
                                 Yes.
                 THE COURT: And do you agree and confirm
6
7
   that these are the admitted exhibits that should go to
8
   the jury for their deliberations?
                 Mr. Muir?
9
10
                           Yes. Your Honor.
                 MR. MUIR:
                 THE COURT: Mr. Stanfield?
11
12
                 MR. STANFIELD: Yes, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Off the record.
13
                 (Whereupon, after a discussion off the
14
   record, the following proceedings were had:)
15
16
                 THE COURT: Mr. Wotring.
17
                 MR. WOTRING: Your Honor, we're outside the
18
   presence of the jury. And it's my understanding that
19
   the first notification that the jury had reached a
   verdict was prior to the exhibits being shown to the
20
21
   jury or delivered to the jury, and Harris County wants
   that noted for the record.
22
23
                 THE COURT: All right. I'll also note for
   the record that I then made sure that the exhibits went
24
25
   back to the jury and that they were required to
```

```
deliberate before they reached their verdict to announce
1
2
   in open Court because I think that's the only
   appropriate thing to do, is to make sure that they have
3
   the exhibits before them. Off the record.
4
                 (Whereupon, the jury entered the courtroom
5
   and the following proceedings were had:)
6
7
                 THE COURT:
                             Please be seated.
8
                 At this time I'll ask the presiding juror
9
   have you reached a verdict in this case?
10
                 PRESIDING JUROR: Yes, ma'am, we have.
                 THE COURT: Is this a unanimous verdict?
11
12
                 PRESIDING JUROR: No, it is not.
13
                 THE COURT: If you'll hand it to Deputy
14
   Loya, please. Thank you.
15
                 Question One, "Do you find that any of the
   following defendants caused, suffered, allowed, or
16
   permitted the discharge of industrial waste containing
17
18
   dioxin into or adjacent to any water in the state at any
19
   time from February 15th, 1973, until March 30th, 2008?"
20
                 Answer as to (A), Champion Paper before
   December 31st, 2000, "No";
21
22
                 Answer as to (B), International Paper on or
   after December 31st, 2000, "No."
23
24
                 Therefore, Question Two and Question Three
25
   were not answered.
```

```
1
                 Question Four, "Do you find that any of the
   following Defendants caused, suffered, allowed, or
2
3
   permitted the handling or disposal of industrial solid
   waste containing dioxin in such a manner so as to cause
4
   the discharge or imminent threat of discharge of
5
   industrial solid waste containing dioxin into or
6
   adjacent to the water of the State at any time from
7
8
   December 31, 1975, until March 30th, 2008?"
                 Answer as to (A), Champion Paper before
9
   December 31st, 2000, "No";
10
11
                 Answer as to (B), International Paper on or
12
   after December 31st, 2000, "No."
                 Therefore, Questions Five and Six were not
13
14
   answered, as well as Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven,
15
   and Twelve.
                It is signed by ten members of the jury.
16
                 MR. WOTRING: Harris County would ask the
17
   Court poll the jury.
18
                 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're
19
   going to do what is called polling the jury. What I am
20
   going to do is -- actually, what I am going to do is
21
   call you juror number one and have you say your name and
22
   then I am going to ask you if this is your verdict.
   I'll start in the back.
23
24
                 Juror number one, is this your verdict?
25
                 MR. BRADLEY:
                               Aaron Bradley, yes.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: Juror number two, is this your
   verdict?
2
3
                 MS. COLE: Lisa Cole, yes.
                 THE COURT: Juror number three, is this
4
5
   your verdict?
6
                 MS. SCHMIDT:
                               Mary Helen Schmidt, yes.
7
                 THE COURT: Juror number four, is this your
   verdict?
9
                 MR. VILLARREAL: Jorge Villarreal, yes.
10
                 THE COURT: Juror number five, is this your
   verdict?
11
12
                 MS. SMITH: Jennifer Smith, no.
13
                 THE COURT: Juror number six, is this your
   verdict?
14
15
                 MR. BODDEN: Nathaniel Lewis Bodden, yes.
16
                 THE COURT: Juror number seven, is this your
   verdict?
17
18
                 MR. REDDELL: John Reddell, no.
19
                 THE COURT: Juror number eight, is this
20
   your verdict?
21
                 MS. SALDANA: Jessica Saldana, yes.
22
                 THE COURT: Juror number nine, is this your
23
   verdict?
24
                 MS. WHITE:
                             Brenda White, yes.
25
                 THE COURT:
                             Juror ten, is this your
```

```
verdict?
1
2
                 MS. BUTLER: Crisaundra Butler, yes.
                 THE COURT: Juror number eleven, is this
3
4
   vour verdict?
5
                 MS. SPERANDEO: Heidi Sperandeo, yes.
6
                 THE COURT: Juror number twelve, is this
7
   your verdict?
8
                 MR. PORTEOUS: Ronald Porteous, yes.
9
                 THE COURT: All right. Do I have a motion?
10
                 MR. CARTER: Your Honor, we move to accept
11
   the verdict.
12
                 THE COURT: The verdict is accepted and
   entered on the record.
13
14
                 Ladies and gentlemen, you have completed
   your service. If you'll retire to the jury room for
15
   just a few moments, we'll take care of some housekeeping
16
   matters and get you home. Thank you.
17
18
                 (Court adjourned)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# THE STATE OF TEXAS COUNTY OF HARRIS

I, Kimberly Kidd, Official Court Reporter in and for the 295th District Court of Harris County, State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contains a true and correct daily copy transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open Court or in chambers and were reported by me.

I further certify that this Reporter's Record of the proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any, admitted, tendered in an offer of proof or offered into evidence.

WITNESS my hand this the 13th day of November, 2014.

/s/ Kimberly Kidd
Kimberly Kidd, Texas CSR No. 2437
Expiration Date: 12/31/15
Official Court Reporter
295th District Court
Harris County, Texas
201 Caroline, 14th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

(713) 368-6453

\$1,000 <sub>[1]</sub> - 32:17 \$10,000 <sub>[1]</sub> - 32:20	<b>1225</b> [1] - 123:10 <b>1228</b> [1] - 123:10 <b>1233</b> [1] - 124:1 <b>1234</b> [1] - 123:10	116:11 1994 [1] - 67:24 1995 [1] - 28:6 1996 [3] - 27:11,	<b>3</b> [5] - 32:6, 32:11, 38:7, 43:7	<b>700</b> [1] - 2:5 <b>707</b> [1] - 123:10 <b>713</b> [1] - 130:25 <b>713.650.8805</b> [1] - 3:7
\$25,000 [4] - 32:22, 33:9, 33:13, 86:15 \$50,000 [1] - 117:7 \$900 [2] - 34:22, 36:17	<b>12548</b> [1] - 2:19 <b>13</b> [3] - 1:15, 5:1, 74:22 <b>133</b> [1] - 123:6 <b>1335</b> [2] - 123:10,	93:23, 116:4 <b>1997</b> [4] - 27:11, 32:20, 38:1, 116:5 <b>1998</b> [1] - 65:9 <b>1st</b> [4] - 30:21, 32:19,	<b>30</b> [2] - 81:14, 95:15 <b>301</b> [1] - 124:2 <b>30th</b> [10] - 29:3, 31:19, 32:3, 32:22, 33:8, 33:21, 56:8, 126:19,	713.651.2663 [1] - 4:7 713.755.7880 [1] - 2:13 713.890.5000 [1] - 3:16
<b>'60s</b> [4] - 58:25, 59:5, 59:9, 59:23	124:7  13th [2] - 1:18, 130:17  14th [4] - 13:22, 16:1, 17:6, 130:24	32:21, 38:1 <b>2</b>	127:8 31 [2] - 95:15, 127:8 31st [8] - 20:14, 32:8, 32:20, 33:21,	<b>713.980.1713</b> [1] - 2:6 <b>77002</b> [5] - 2:6, 2:12, 3:6, 3:16, 130:24 <b>77002-5242</b> [1] - 4:6
<b>'65</b> [3] - 15:2, 55:16, 60:20 <b>'66</b> [7] - 15:23, 48:1,	<b>15</b> [3] - 30:19, 34:17, 64:12 <b>15TH</b> [1] - 2:12	<b>2</b> [6] - 20:12, 31:24, 32:6, 43:7, 115:12 <b>2,000</b> [1] - 43:21	126:21, 126:23, 127:10, 127:12 <b>333rd</b> [1] - 10:4	<b>78711-2548</b> [1] - 2:19
60:20, 61:15, 61:17, 62:2 ' <b>70</b> [1] - 94:6 ' <b>75</b> [1] - 95:16	<b>15th</b> [9] - 28:16, 29:2, 29:4, 30:9, 30:14, 31:18, 32:2, 63:4, 126:19	<b>2,000-page</b> [1] - 44:6 <b>20</b> [4] - 43:7, 64:12, 117:1, 124:8 <b>2000</b> [12] - 14:10, 19:1,	<b>35</b> [6] - 46:9, 57:8, 85:22, 85:24, 87:8, 87:15 <b>368-6453</b> [1] - 130:25	<b>8</b> [5] - 9:20, 36:23, 37:18, 37:23, 86:2 <b>851</b> [1] - 123:24
'80s [1] - 21:4 '87/'88 [1] - 21:7 'causes [4] - 62:18, 62:23, 94:18, 112:18	<b>18</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 123:10 <b>19</b> <sub>[4]</sub> - 15:2, 42:12, 118:16, 124:8 <b>1955</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 16:5, 16:6	19:15, 19:17, 24:9, 25:2, 32:8, 33:8, 126:21, 126:23, 127:10, 127:12	<b>4</b> <b>4</b> <sub>[13]</sub> - 9:17, 9:18,	<b>88</b> [1] - 108:9
'power [1] - 101:3 'Screening [1] - 43:22	<b>1960's</b> [1] - 14:19 <b>1965</b> [6] - 15:8, 15:16, 16:17, 48:1, 60:9,	<b>2002</b> [1] - 67:25 <b>20036-5306</b> [1] - 3:22 <b>2005</b> [6] - 28:8, 42:12,	9:19, 24:16, 32:6, 33:14, 52:25, 54:12, 62:23, 63:5, 101:16,	<b>9</b> [4] - 34:19, 36:16, 37:20, 50:5 <b>90</b> [1] - 102:14
/s [1] - 130:21	87:10 <b>1966</b> [20] - 13:22, 16:1, 26:21, 49:19, 57:16,	43:4, 43:6, 43:14, 44:13 <b>2006</b> [4] - 43:22,	116:7, 117:10 <b>40</b> [1] - 60:8 <b>400</b> [1] - 16:8	<b>901</b> [1] - 123:10
1	57:18, 57:21, 58:13, 58:16, 58:17, 59:17, 61:13, 77:14, 77:17,	67:20, 67:21, 69:8 <b>2007</b> [1] - 44:3 <b>2008</b> [15] - 19:2, 20:14,	<b>4000</b> [1] - 3:15 <b>44</b> [1] - 82:16 <b>45</b> [5] - 82:17, 82:22,	Aaron [1] - 127:25 abandoned [1] - 13:21
<b>1</b> [13] - 1:1, 32:6, 49:11, 52:9, 52:24, 54:8, 54:11, 57:17, 62:22, 63:5, 117:7 <b>10</b> [4] - 37:23, 37:24, 64:12, 95:16	79:21, 80:1, 87:10, 94:17, 95:21, 118:17 <b>1968</b> [4] - 17:6, 17:16, 117:2, 117:11 <b>1973</b> [24] - 17:24,	29:3, 31:19, 32:3, 32:17, 33:8, 33:21, 43:24, 44:9, 86:8, 88:17, 95:15, 126:19, 127:8	83:7, 87:16, 100:18 <b>453</b> [2] - 105:22, 105:24 <b>46</b> [1] - 92:2 <b>4th</b> [2] - 26:21, 52:16	abandoning [1] - 117:5 ability [3] - 42:4, 44:25, 63:6 able [12] - 9:24, 25:11, 36:1, 45:16, 45:17.
<b>10.6</b> [1] - 34:16 <b>100</b> [1] - 121:20	25:18, 28:16, 29:2, 29:4, 30:9, 30:14, 30:19, 31:19, 32:2,	<b>2009</b> [4] - 69:4, 69:7, 93:24, 94:7 <b>201</b> [1] - 130:24	5	52:15, 83:11, 83:13, 97:6, 97:12, 106:6,
1000 [1] - 3:15 1019 [1] - 2:12 104 [3] - 18:15, 21:13, 22:13 1050 [1] - 3:21	32:16, 32:18, 49:19, 49:21, 57:18, 63:4, 76:17, 76:20, 77:22, 86:8, 94:15, 94:16, 118:4, 126:19	2010 [1] - 82:16 2011 [1] - 82:16 2011-76724 [1] - 1:2 2014 [4] - 1:15, 1:18, 5:1, 130:18	<b>5</b> [1] - 33:24 <b>50</b> [2] - 83:6, 87:16 <b>512-463.2012</b> [1] - 2:20 <b>5300</b> [1] - 3:6	106:13 <b>above-entitled</b> [1] - 1:18 <b>above-styled</b> [1] - 130:10
<b>1053</b> [2] - 123:10, 124:5 <b>11</b> [1] - 38:10 <b>110</b> [1] - 16:8	<b>1975</b> [4] - 33:21, 63:5, 95:15, 127:8 <b>1977</b> [1] - 86:2	<b>202.955.8500</b> [1] - 3:22 <b>211</b> [2] - 123:22,	<b>6</b>	absolutely [4] - 50:23, 65:5, 71:19, 81:24 absorb [1] - 117:20 accept [9] - 33:6,
1100 [1] - 3:6 1111 [1] - 4:6 1147 [1] - 124:4 1168 [1] - 124:6 119 [2] - 105:22	1978 [1] - 26:5 1985 [8] - 13:24, 14:3, 18:6, 18:7, 18:14, 32:18, 32:19, 33:2 1986 [4] - 13:25, 18:7, 20:6, 22:20	123:24 211-A [1] - 123:22 2437 [1] - 130:21 25 [2] - 38:16, 69:2 25th [1] - 24:9 25TH [1] - 4:6	51:11, 54:7, 54:11, 94:12, 95:18, 95:24 600 [1] - 2:5 65 [1] - 105:11 691 [1] - 22:14	35:14, 36:6, 36:21, 119:12, 119:15, 119:20, 119:24, 129:10 accepted [5] - 66:4, 76:4, 84:5, 84:7,
11th [1] - 16:10 12 [8] - 9:15, 12:20, 38:15, 46:5, 51:12, 54:11, 95:12, 95:18 12/31/15 [1] - 130:22	<b>1987</b> [1] - 74:21 <b>1989</b> [11] - 13:25, 18:8, 18:22, 20:6, 22:20, 26:16, 28:5, 30:21, 74:19, 115:24,	28th [2] - 15:16, 16:17 295TH [1] - 1:11 295th [2] - 130:4, 130:23 298-B [1] - 65:21	<b>7 7</b> [5] - 34:12, 35:24, 96:1, 116:9, 117:13	76.4, 64.5, 64.7, 129:12 accommodate [1] - 9:24 accordance [1] -

120:16 according [1] - 63:7 account [1] - 77:3 accurate [4] - 42:16, 112:3, 117:22, 117:23 accused [2] - 49:12, 49:13 accusing [1] - 50:21 acknowledge [2] -65:13, 77:7 acknowledged [1] acquiring [1] - 24:4 Acquisitions [1] -19:16 Act [4] - 7:12, 8:14, 49:14, 50:4 act [8] - 36:23, 37:2, 37:4, 37:5, 37:10, 37:11, 37:16 acted [2] - 47:18, 54:24 acting [1] - 1:5 action [8] - 20:16, 25:20, 26:3, 27:15, 34:14, 34:18, 81:8, 81:9 Action [1] - 105:25 active [1] - 61:11 actively [1] - 110:21 activities [1] - 71:1 activity [11] - 67:6, 71:11, 72:7, 72:9, 72:12, 72:14, 72:20, 73:8, 73:10, 75:4, 75:23 acts [2] - 9:20, 38:12 actual [1] - 117:17 add [1] - 109:16 added [1] - 5:15 addition [1] - 59:11 additional [1] - 20:21 address [7] - 11:14, 42:21, 87:18, 98:25, 99:14, 114:22, 116:24 addressed [6] - 10:15, 35:11, 55:4, 55:5, 55:9, 60:7 addresses [3] - 34:12, 110:3, 110:5 addressing [1] - 35:10 adjacent [5] - 31:17, 33:20. 64:17. 126:18, 127:7 adjourned [1] - 129:18 Administrative [1] -105:23 admission [1] - 106:5

admit [5] - 74:1, 74:2, 76:6, 85:24, 88:13 admits [3] - 58:9, 72:5. 84:1 admitted [2] - 125:7, 130:15 aerial [4] - 17:23, 25:17, 30:10, 116:11 affect [2] - 7:6, 8:8 affected [2] - 28:11, 73:24 affecting [1] - 27:10 affiliated [1] - 24:17 agencies [2] - 11:13, 11:14 agency [2] - 39:24, 90:23 **Agency** [1] - 43:19 ago [6] - 10:14, 10:16, 20:11, 87:16, 91:25, 109:17 agree [7] - 67:19, 78:14, 84:2, 114:6, 115:1, 116:1, 125:6 agreed [8] - 5:18, 6:20, 7:15, 7:25, 58:7, 116:2, 116:4, 116:7 agreeing [1] - 123:16 agreement [6] - 6:15. 6:23, 38:7, 123:15. 123:21, 124:15 agrees [5] - 6:3, 6:4, 57:10, 59:3, 74:16 ahead [1] - 39:8 air [1] - 65:24 aisles [1] - 10:2 alert [1] - 27:18 **ALL** [1] - 54:1 Allen [3] - 90:18, 93:9, 93:22 allow [16] - 12:13, 14:12, 16:16, 16:20, 49:2, 52:6, 64:21, 86:24, 94:13, 94:16, 95:13, 96:24, 100:22, 101:9, 103:22, 107:15 allowed [12] - 22:24, 31:16, 33:16, 50:11, 51:5, 64:3, 66:20, 74:25, 94:10, 95:9, 126:16, 127:2 3:9 allows [5] - 62:18, 62:24, 94:18, 105:7, 112:18 almost [3] - 39:20,

83:5, 95:16

106:5

alone [2] - 67:17,

apart [8] - 26:13, 29:8,

**AMANDES** [1] - 3:18 31:3, 64:16, 75:16, amendment [2] -78:10, 80:24 104:1, 104:2 apologize [2] - 39:8, 106:18 amount [15] - 12:17, 32:17, 34:7, 34:17, appear [1] - 51:12 34:19, 35:20, 85:5, appreciate [5] - 38:18, 86:25, 87:2, 87:4, 97:3, 97:4, 97:24, 117:17, 118:3, 103:17 120:14, 121:7, 122:3 appreciated [1] amounts [1] - 124:7 63:22 analyzed [2] - 21:9, approach [4] - 5:17, 70:20 9:6, 35:2, 56:9 **AND** [4] - 1:10, 2:10, appropriate [25] -3:4, 3:20 11:20, 12:18, 12:21, announce [1] - 126:1 32:14, 32:20, 33:5, 33:8, 33:12, 34:5, announced [1] - 11:23 36:9, 39:2, 40:25, announcement [1] -41:1, 102:18, 9:23 **ANSWER** [36] - 20:18, 103:25, 105:4, 21:1, 21:5, 21:12, 107:5, 119:10, 119:11, 119:18, 21:18, 22:2, 22:9, 121:8, 121:14, 23:24, 24:1, 24:5, 122:2, 122:3, 126:3 24:13, 24:21, 53:10, Appropriation [1] -53:16, 53:19, 53:21, 57:22, 58:3, 59:10, 17:7 59:14, 59:23, 60:2, approval [9] - 16:18. 47:19. 48:18. 54:25. 61:9, 65:5, 69:24, 55:6, 56:10, 93:4, 71:4, 71:18, 71:21, 93:5, 93:11 71:25, 80:15, 81:24, approve [2] - 48:9, 83:4, 84:7, 85:7, 50:12 86:22, 87:2 approved [9] - 16:12, Answer [1] - 127:11 answer [43] - 9:17, 47:22, 48:9, 51:6, 54:20, 54:23, 55:25, 24:15, 31:22, 33:22, 60:25, 92:25 37:17, 37:23, 38:3, 38:13, 42:3, 44:25, approves [1] - 54:13 52:9, 52:24, 53:7, April [2] - 24:9, 43:14 63:8, 64:5, 75:1, area [11] - 20:4, 25:14, 83:20, 86:5, 86:9, 64:17, 65:15, 65:17, 87:16, 94:23, 95:17, 66:12, 66:13, 73:19, 95:22, 96:3, 96:4, 77:19, 116:14, 96:5, 96:6, 96:7, 116:16 96:11, 96:12, 96:13, arque [10] - 46:20, 96:14, 96:16, 96:17, 101:2. 102:2. 103:2. 96:18, 96:19, 96:20, 103:4. 103:14. 126:20, 126:22, 103:16, 103:18, 127:9 106:8 answered [3] - 96:2, argued [3] - 106:4, 126:25, 127:14 107:25, 109:2 answering [1] - 44:16 arguing [1] - 103:6 answers [2] - 45:2, argument [25] - 9:25, 115:6 10:8, 11:19, 37:14, **ANTHONY** [2] - 2:21, 38:18, 98:5, 98:17, 98:24, 99:7, 99:25, anti [2] - 12:3, 12:4 100:3, 100:6, anti-business [1] -100:17, 101:5, 12:3 105:2, 106:1, 106:3, anti-corporation [1] -106:8, 107:5, 107:11, 107:17,

108:10, 112:10 ARGUMENT [5] -10:11, 39:12, 45:13, 87:24, 113:6 arguments [4] - 8:18, 10:5, 101:1, 122:23 Army [2] - 43:25, 114:18 arranged [1] - 38:8 aside [1] - 22:7 assess [2] - 89:16, 108:14 assessed [3] - 12:14, 88:20, 91:4 assignment [2] - 68:4, 68:14 **ASSISTANT** [2] - 2:14, 2:22 assisted [1] - 1:21 associated [4] -23:23, 24:4, 85:8, 119:22 assume [4] - 101:14, 101:22, 101:23, 123:11 assumed [2] - 15:13, 75:24 attach [1] - 103:7 attached [3] - 82:4, 103:8 Attached [1] - 15:17 attempt [2] - 27:15, 72:2 attention [2] - 63:22, 97:4 Attorney [1] - 114:8 attorney [2] - 122:9, 122:12 **ATTORNEY** [4] - 2:11, 2:14, 2:18, 2:22 attorney's [10] - 34:13, 34:19, 35:7, 35:15, 36:8, 92:18, 96:15, 121:3, 121:4, 121:10 Attorney's [1] - 12:19 attorneys [4] - 68:1, 69:3, 69:25, 70:2 attorneys' [1] - 122:22 attribute [1] - 115:19 attributes [2] - 114:16, 114:19 August [6] - 17:16, 32:18, 32:20, 61:15, 61:17, 117:11 **AUSTIN**[1] - 2:19 available [4] - 24:6. 24:7, 24:12, 64:20 **AVENUE** [1] - 3:21 await [1] - 122:19 107:24, 108:3, award [2] - 121:7,

121:10 awarded [1] - 41:11 aware [3] - 20:19, 59:12, 59:14 awkward [2] - 35:7, 35:8

#### В

bad [4] - 68:18, 105:16, 107:1, 107:7 **BAKER** [3] - 2:4, 2:8, 111:12 Baker [15] - 1:19, 12:3, 36:12, 47:10, 48:25, 51:24, 58:12, 88:15, 88:24, 89:5, 90:4, 91:23, 100:20, 114:13, 121:9 Baker's [1] - 114:4 BALLESTEROS [1] banks [2] - 25:14, 27:22 barge [2] - 15:9, 77:3 barging [1] - 15:14 Barrett [1] - 5:6 **BARRETT** [1] - 3:8 **based** [9] - 24:15, 30:4, 38:13, 44:22, 81:19, 84:25, 94:25, 119:19, 120:21 basin [1] - 124:3 basins [1] - 20:3 basis [4] - 9:16, 30:6, 31:4, 33:2 basis.. [1] - 30:25 bayou [1] - 20:4 bearing [3] - 7:7, 8:9, 89:9 became [7] - 20:19, 24:16, 72:22, 73:25, 79:17, 80:20 become [3] - 17:19, 73:14, 82:18 becomes [4] - 29:7, 41:3, 81:4, 81:8 Bedient [27] - 28:14, 29:24, 31:4, 33:25, 52:17, 53:4, 68:10, 69:10, 69:19, 70:14, 70:21, 71:13, 74:11, 80:9, 81:21, 82:3, 82:7, 83:9, 84:24, 85:1, 85:2, 86:1, 86:19, 99:10, 99:21, 107:19, 118:3 Bedient's [1] - 18:3 began [5] - 15:14,

73:8, 73:10, 73:21,

123:1 begin [2] - 43:2, 122:24 beginning [9] - 9:23, 36:18. 50:18. 56:23. 57:2. 78:6. 80:22. 119:8, 122:11 begins [2] - 57:18, 95:15 behalf [7] - 35:13, 35:14, 71:20, 90:12, 97:23, 124:15, 124:18 behind [1] - 5:15 belabor [1] - 19:9 belief [1] - 42:7 below [2] - 38:2, 73:21 bench [2] - 9:8, 35:3 beneath [1] - 26:17 Benedict [3] - 39:9, 45:5, 113:15 **BENEDICT** [5] - 2:21, 6:4, 7:16, 39:13, 39:16 benefit [1] - 115:22 berm [2] - 25:19, 30:12 berms [2] - 17:24, 29:2 best [3] - 21:18, 42:4, 44:24 better [3] - 25:10, 117:18, 117:24 between [12] - 17:25, 19:11, 19:13, 30:16, 46:7, 47:9, 48:4, 54:15, 54:16, 67:24, 86:8, 120:13 beyond [5] - 20:20, 56:10, 110:2, 114:14, 120:20 billed [1] - 92:9 billions [1] - 40:16 bit [6] - 11:3, 41:16, 63:24, 66:13, 103:19 blatantly [1] - 102:13 blinders [1] - 71:6 board [2] - 117:2, 117:4 Board [1] - 17:16 boats [1] - 25:15 Bob [5] - 56:7, 57:9, 90:3, 90:13, 115:11 **BOCKIUS** [1] - 3:15 **BODDEN** [1] - 128:15 Bodden [1] - 128:15

**body** [3] - 119:5,

120:10, 121:25

**bottom** [1] - 87:9

**BOX** [1] - 2:19

87:25

**BRADLEY** [1] - 127:25 Bradley [1] - 127:25 breach [6] - 17:24, 25:19, 29:3, 66:19, 76:17, 77:22 breaches [1] - 30:10 break [13] - 39:7, 39:10, 39:17, 39:19, 44:20, 45:8, 75:16, 78:10, 98:2, 98:5, 100:10, 100:12, 123:1 breaking [1] - 29:8 breaks [2] - 26:13, brenda [1] - 128:24 BRIAN [1] - 3:11 brick [1] - 79:14 brief [5] - 39:7, 39:17, 45:7, 98:2, 98:4 **briefed** [1] - 20:1 briefly [3] - 25:12, 42:22, 72:23 bring [4] - 36:11, 39:7, 58:22, 90:24 bringing [9] - 34:14, 36:16, 88:10, 98:19, 99:12, 99:20, 106:11, 106:16, 106:20 broke [2] - 64:16, 80:24 brought [17] - 11:2, 28:13, 29:24, 50:13, 58:19, 64:17, 65:16, 67:18, 68:16, 88:12, 89:25, 90:1, 90:2, 90:19, 100:16, 105:14, 114:21 Brown [1] - 29:25 **BRUNS** [1] - 3:5 budget [3] - 61:18, 62:6, 62:7 build [2] - 53:20, 73:1 **building** [1] - 55:14 burden [1] - 87:6 Burma [1] - 16:11 Burns' [2] - 54:18, 54:20 business [1] - 12:3 BUTLER [1] - 129:2 Butler [1] - 129:2 Butter [2] - 15:4, 55:3 **butter** [1] - 15:5 buy [4] - 23:14, 33:10, 119:14, 119:21 **BY** [10] - 2:7, 2:14, 2:21, 3:8, 3:17, 3:23, 4:8, 10:12, 39:13,

#### C

calculate [1] - 36:19 calculated [1] - 34:22 calculation [2] -76:13, 77:3 calculations [1] -32:10 candid [1] - 41:20 cannot [4] - 85:2, 85:25, 87:5, 102:2 **CAPITOL** [1] - 2:19 capped [1] - 121:7 Captain [1] - 25:12 cardboard [15] -26:11, 26:13, 29:7, 31:2, 76:2, 78:7, 78:8, 78:9, 78:21, 78:23, 79:3, 79:7, 79:10, 79:11, 118:9 care [4] - 26:2, 37:9, 39:8, 129:16 carefully [4] - 97:13, 115:3, 121:22, 121:23 Caroline [2] - 1:19, 130:24 Carter [11] - 45:11, 87:18, 87:22, 97:16, 97:25, 99:25, 101:13, 102:2, 109:2, 109:14 CARTER [10] - 3:17, 35:1, 45:12, 45:14, 87:23, 87:25, 100:5, 103:4, 105:8, 129:10 case [112] - 7:2, 8:4, 10:22, 11:1, 11:3, 11:5, 11:8, 11:22, 12:9, 12:18, 13:11, 19:3, 19:11, 23:4, 23:16, 25:6, 25:25, 26:25, 27:6, 27:9, 27:24, 28:10, 32:13, 32:14, 34:21, 35:8, 36:10, 36:14, 36:15, 36:16, 36:18, 38:19, 38:24, 39:2, 39:25, 40:18, 45:18, 50:2, 50:15, 50:17, 53:2, 56:22, 56:25, 57:4, 58:23, 61:16, 63:21, 65:10, 67:16, 68:1, 68:16, 69:11, 69:21, 70:16, 71:23, 72:3, 75:19, 75:21, 76:11, 78:6, 80:6, 80:20, 81:18, 81:20, 84:10, 87:20, 88:7, 88:9,

88:13, 89:18, 89:20,

90:3, 90:10, 90:14, 90:15, 90:17, 90:19, 90:20, 91:4, 91:11, 92:7, 92:10, 92:16, 92:21, 92:22, 95:3, 97:1, 102:22, 103:18, 104:10, 105:14, 106:11, 106:19, 107:6, 112:15, 114:6, 114:7, 114:11, 114:13, 115:3, 115:8, 118:15, 119:10, 119:24, 120:5, 121:11, 122:15, 122:17, 126:9 cases [4] - 11:1, 36:11, 86:15, 103:16 CAUSE [1] - 1:2 caused [22] - 9:19, 22:24, 29:4, 31:16, 33:15, 37:1, 37:5, 37:6, 37:16, 38:12, 50:10, 51:5, 64:3, 73:13, 74:4, 74:15, 74:24, 94:10, 95:8, 118:5, 126:16, 127:2 causes [3] - 34:17, 104:22, 105:7 causing [3] - 42:15, 74:8, 74:9 ceased [1] - 59:13 ceasing [2] - 57:15, 57:21 **cells** [1] - 69:5 Center [1] - 28:22 central [3] - 77:21, 82:24, 83:2 certain [2] - 35:20, 124:7 certainly [5] - 62:15, 71:16, 102:16, 114:19, 122:13 certainty [1] - 30:17 certificate [1] - 8:24 certify [2] - 130:5, 130:13 chain [1] - 16:6 Chair [1] - 30:1 **challenge** [1] - 97:13 chambers [1] - 130:11 Champion [126] - 7:4, 8:6, 13:7, 13:11, 13:17, 13:20, 13:25, 14:5, 14:9, 14:19, 15:8, 15:16, 15:21, 16:1, 16:6, 16:25, 17:6, 17:13, 18:10, 18:11, 18:17, 18:19,

18:25, 19:4, 19:6, 19:13, 19:18, 19:22, 20:7, 20:10, 20:15, 20:25, 21:1, 21:23, 22:8, 22:15, 22:22, 23:5, 23:7, 23:10, 23:16, 23:23, 24:4, 24:10, 24:16, 24:19, 25:1, 25:2, 25:5, 25:24, 26:6, 26:19, 26:24, 27:12, 27:24, 31:21, 32:23, 33:23, 34:2, 34:10, 37:18, 38:6, 48:3, 48:11, 48:17, 48:19, 50:5, 50:7, 50:9, 50:10, 50:23, 50:25, 51:1, 51:9, 51:16, 51:20, 51:23, 52:18, 52:21, 52:24, 53:1, 53:5, 53:8, 54:1, 54:3, 54:5, 54:24, 55:5, 55:9, 55:19, 55:20, 56:3, 56:8, 56:15, 56:17, 57:10, 57:13, 57:19, 57:25, 58:4, 58:7, 58:13, 59:15, 59:20, 60:4, 60:10, 64:2, 64:15, 71:10, 72:3, 72:6, 72:8, 72:25, 74:2, 74:20, 74:23, 75:7, 75:9, 85:12, 94:24, 118:17, 123:9, 126:20, 127:9 Champion's [6] -15:14, 15:18, 15:22, 19:25, 24:19, 24:22 Champion/IP [1] -74:24 **chance** [1] - 97:10 change [4] - 9:12, 30:12, 49:8, 73:14 Channel [1] - 43:17 characteristic [1] -79:4 characteristics [2] -79:5, 79:10 characterization [1] -44:15 characterized [1] -21:13 Charge [41] - 6:17, 7:25, 8:17, 8:19, 9:2, 9:13, 9:21, 19:19, 31:10, 31:12, 42:3, 42:6, 42:25, 44:25, 47:5, 47:6, 47:15, 51:11, 94:9, 94:13, 101:6, 101:8,

101:14, 102:5, 102:9, 102:22, 103:21, 104:2, 104:3, 104:4, 104:6, 104:9, 112:12, 112:17, 113:18, 113:24, 115:5, 119:3, 121:23, 122:22 charges [1] - 90:2 chart [2] - 31:6, 66:16 **CHASE** [1] - 2:5 **cheap** [2] - 78:8, 118:8 cheaper [1] - 25:10 chemical [1] - 82:1 chemicals [1] - 82:2 chocolate [1] - 15:4 CHRIS [1] - 3:18 cites [1] - 52:12 citizens [2] - 120:9, 120:12 civil [2] - 121:5, 122:2 claim [2] - 25:5, 25:11 claimed [4] - 89:10, 89:17, 94:15, 108:15 claiming [1] - 102:13 claims [6] - 5:12, 7:2, 8:4, 34:18, 74:19, 115:10 clarified [2] - 113:19, 113:22 clarify [4] - 103:25, 111:23, 112:11, 115:10 cleaning [2] - 89:14, 108:13 cleanup [8] - 47:22, 47:23, 88:15, 88:23, 89:4, 89:19, 109:8, 110:1 clear [4] - 72:5, 86:19, 101:14, 105:4 clearly [2] - 38:14, 107:24 client [1] - 124:19 cling [1] - 82:6 clip [1] - 20:11 **close** [2] - 27:3, 88:2 close-up [1] - 27:3 closer [1] - 73:14 CLOSING [5] - 10:11, 39:12, 45:13, 87:24, 113:6 closing [15] - 8:18, 9:25, 10:5, 10:7, 10:20, 51:7, 82:9, 98:5, 98:24, 99:6, 100:16, 101:1. 105:2, 106:8, 107:11 closure [3] - 59:12,

59:15, 62:2 co [1] - 28:21 co-director [1] - 28:21 **COLE** [1] - 128:3 cole [2] - 46:1, 46:8 Cole [1] - 128:3 **COLIN** [1] - 3:10 collectively [2] -117:21, 117:22 colloids [1] - 29:10 colonel [1] - 114:18 column [2] - 26:14, 29:23 coming [7] - 18:16, 22:16, 29:11, 30:23, 49:4, 100:23, 122:14 comment [5] - 12:1, 99:12, 99:17, 99:21, 121:2 comments [2] - 12:22, 109:13 Commission [2] -39:22, 42:14 COMMISSION [1] committed [1] - 38:4 common [2] - 94:14, 109:8 communities [1] -25:9 community [3] -120:6, 122:5, 122:13 companies [9] -23:13, 25:7, 27:2, 28:2, 35:12, 85:21, 119:14, 119:20, 120:15 company [12] - 12:10, 20:1, 23:9, 33:10, 33:12, 51:19, 52:19, 54:4, 56:3, 86:16, 89:8, 95:21 Company [1] - 14:19 COMPANY [2] - 1:9, 3:14 complete [4] - 5:17, 32:5, 42:22, 112:21 completed [1] -129:14 Completely [1] - 117:8 completely [5] -17:17, 17:18, 76:23, 117:12, 119:4 complicated [1] -115:5 comply [1] - 55:20 computer [1] - 1:21 computer-assisted [1] - 1:21 computerized [1] -

1:21 concealed [1] - 68:23 concentrated [1] -85:4 concentration [2] -76:5, 84:21 concentrations [2] -31:7, 83:15 concern [3] - 24:25, 25:21, 88:13 concerned [4] - 41:2, 62:16, 75:9, 88:8 concerning [1] - 45:18 concerns [1] - 60:7 conclude [2] - 11:19, 38:17 concluded [3] - 21:4, 22:12, 24:24 concludes [1] - 7:13 conclusive [1] -118:19 condition [2] - 16:18, 30:12 Condor [1] - 19:16 conduct [4] - 11:6, 21:24, 24:9, 33:10 conducting [1] - 44:5 Conference [1] -104:4 confess [2] - 34:25, 35:6 confidence [3] -46:18, 88:3 confidential [1] - 5:10 confines [1] - 109:15 confirm [1] - 125:6 confirmed [3] - 18:16, 20:5. 124:25 confirms [2] - 22:15, 30:19 **CONGRESS** [1] - 2:12 **connected** [1] - 34:2 CONNECTICUT [1] -3:21 connection [9] - 17:1, 17:4, 17:25, 18:8, 28:7, 30:24, 37:3, 47:2, 47:5 Connelly [4] - 12:2, 90:4, 90:9, 91:23 **CONNELLY** [1] - 2:4 conscience [1] -121:13 consider [22] - 7:8, 8:10, 16:2, 17:9, 36:4, 40:11, 68:5, 68:8, 68:11, 70:25,

75:22, 106:14,

106:24, 107:10,

112:14, 115:2,

115:5, 115:7, 115:21, 118:14, 119:3, 121:22 consideration [5] -38:19, 108:9, 108:18, 108:24, 124:9 considered [1] - 35:25 considering [2] -99:11, 120:19 consistency [1] - 29:6 consistent [1] - 80:2 construct [1] - 53:8 constructed [3] -72:24, 73:2, 73:3 constructing [1] -55:14 construction [1] -53:23 consulted [1] - 28:22 contact [3] - 75:15, 76:19, 77:23 contain [5] - 16:22, 19:23, 102:25, 104:16, 113:25 contained [5] - 18:12, 21:25, 22:16, 28:4, 29:6 containing [16] - 13:8, 13:13, 14:4, 14:13, 22:25, 26:4, 31:17, 32:4, 33:17, 33:19, 64:9, 95:10, 115:15, 126:17, 127:4, 127:6 contains [3] - 29:16, 104:10, 130:6 contamination [1] -20:17 contents [3] - 17:22, 26:9, 31:3 context [2] - 107:8, 109:1 contingency [1] -89:21 continue [1] - 76:1 continued [1] - 43:15 continuing [2] - 59:1, 59:6 continuously [1] -14:23 contract [19] - 15:13, 38:7, 47:9, 47:10, 48:12, 48:17, 49:22, 49:24, 50:6, 52:19, 55:22, 58:14, 58:16, 95:20, 95:21, 103:9 contracted [3] - 51:18, 52:3, 54:3 contractor [24] - 48:4, 48:5, 48:11, 48:13,

48:18, 49:23, 52:4, 52:7, 55:5, 55:6, 55:7, 55:11, 55:12, 55:18, 55:19, 55:20, 56:5, 56:9, 60:10, 60:11, 60:16, 60:20, 93:4, 93:14 contrary [3] - 44:15, 99:2, 116:19 contribute [1] - 113:1 contributing [1] -111:10 control [20] - 11:15, 41:2, 41:15, 48:20, 90:18, 90:23, 91:1, 91:3, 114:6, 114:7, 114:14, 114:15, 119:18, 120:8, 120:11, 120:15, 120:25, 122:1, 122:4 Control [1] - 69:15 conversations [4] -54:15, 69:22, 70:6, copies [1] - 52:14 copy [4] - 6:23, 15:17, 112:13, 130:6 COPY [1] - 1:14 **core** [2] - 82:20, 83:2 corner [5] - 28:9, 66:19, 67:5, 77:23, 116:3 CORP [1] - 4:4 corporate [4] - 19:14, 19:21, 23:3, 23:18 corporation [1] - 12:4 CORPORATION [1] -1:10 corporations [3] -12:5, 12:7, 19:12 Corps [3] - 43:25, 44:2 correct [37] - 9:12, 9:14, 21:12, 24:13, 24:21, 25:25, 53:10, 53:15, 53:16, 53:19, 61:8, 70:16, 70:18, 71:5, 71:17, 71:21, 74:10, 74:15, 74:16, 76:23, 80:11, 80:12, 83:4, 85:6, 86:21, 86:22, 87:1, 91:2, 91:5, 92:17, 94:3, 94:4, 111:11, 111:15, 111:16, 121:5, 130:6 corrected [1] - 123:25 correctly [3] - 57:13, 125:1, 130:14 COUNSEL [5] - 2:3, 2:17, 3:4, 3:14, 4:3

counsel [15] - 37:14, 91:18, 98:17, 98:24, 99:1, 101:2, 101:4, 106:3, 106:4, 108:19, 110:19, 118:25, 123:18, 124:20. 130:8 country [5] - 11:11, 11:17, 11:25, 38:25, 122:1 **COUNTY** [6] - 1:4, 1:8, 2:3, 2:11, 2:14, 130:1 county [2] - 11:10, 13:15 County [129] - 1:20, 6:3, 6:19, 6:25, 8:2, 12:2, 12:4, 12:6, 12:19, 13:19, 28:18, 32:13, 33:5, 34:6, 34:14, 35:13, 36:2, 40:18, 47:22, 48:7, 48:9, 49:7, 50:11, 50:22, 54:13, 54:22, 55:25, 58:9, 58:17, 58:20, 59:8, 60:3, 60:8, 65:9, 66:25, 67:19, 68:17, 69:3, 69:13, 69:21, 69:25, 70:2, 71:6, 71:10, 71:20, 72:5, 72:10, 72:13, 72:15, 72:20, 73:16, 74:19, 75:4, 75:12, 79:19, 81:3, 82:12, 85:20, 87:17, 88:10, 88:11, 89:13, 90:7, 90:21, 90:23, 91:12, 91:14, 91:19, 92:23, 92:24, 93:12, 93:15, 93:18, 93:21, 93:23, 94:2, 94:5, 96:25, 97:11, 98:14, 98:18, 98:21, 99:19, 100:25, 102:11, 103:20, 105:1, 105:15, 105:20, 106:2, 106:9, 106:11, 106:12, 106:15, 107:14, 107:22, 108:12, 108:16, 109:10, 109:15, 109:22, 109:24, 110:1, 110:5, 110:16, 110:20, 110:21, 111:2, 111:6, 111:10, 112:1, 112:23, 113:1, 113:20, 114:8, 114:10, 120:7,

120:8, 122:5, 122:15, 123:16, 124:15, 125:21, 127:16, 130:4, 130:23 County's [31] - 47:18, 48:18, 52:11, 53:4, 54:24, 58:21, 63:7, 64:7, 68:1, 68:23, 69:9, 74:1, 75:2, 75:14, 75:20, 78:5, 81:1, 83:19, 85:15, 89:3, 90:7, 90:14, 91:11, 93:19, 95:1, 95:5, 108:5, 108:22, 113:22, 114:7, 123:15 couple [12] - 10:16, 19:20, 28:20, 39:18, 40:6, 63:24, 68:2, 87:18, 98:6, 118:13, 119:7, 124:17 course [4] - 44:9, 62:10, 73:13, 119:10 Court [40] - 5:17, 5:19, 5:20, 6:16, 6:23, 37:22, 41:5, 42:2, 42:25, 44:24, 51:11, 58:6, 95:2, 99:6, 100:3, 101:15, 101:24, 102:15, 102:21, 103:24, 104:5, 104:15, 105:21, 106:3, 107:4, 108:24, 110:9, 113:19, 113:21, 120:23, 124:10, 126:2, 127:17, 129:18, 130:3, 130:4, 130:11, 130:22, 130:23 court [1] - 36:13 COURT [77] - 1:2, 1:4, 5:3, 5:20, 6:5, 6:10, 6:13, 7:14, 7:19, 7:23, 8:21, 9:7, 9:11, 9:19, 35:2, 39:5, 45:5, 45:10, 63:16, 87:22, 97:25, 98:3, 98:8, 98:12, 99:14, 99:22, 100:9, 100:14, 102:18, 103:3, 104:8, 104:17, 104:24, 105:3, 105:10, 107:10, 109:19, 110:12, 110:15, 110:24, 111:9, 111:14, 111:18,

112:8, 122:20, 123:3, 123:7, 123:11, 123:14, 124:11, 124:14, 124:17, 124:23, 124:25, 125:4, 125:6, 125:11, 125:13, 125:16, 125:23, 126:7, 126:11, 126:13, 127:18, 128:1, 128:4, 128:7, 128:10, 128:13, 128:16, 128:19, 128:22, 128:25, 129:3, 129:6, 129:9, 129:12 Court's [13] - 8:19, 89:6, 98:20, 99:3, 101:5, 101:6, 108:9, 108:19, 113:18, 113:24, 120:19, 122:22, 123:23 courtroom [9] - 7:21, 11:23, 11:24, 72:11, 98:9, 112:6, 113:13, 122:25, 126:5 **CRAIG** [1] - 3:18 create [1] - 42:8 created [1] - 111:8 credibility [2] - 35:16, 70:22 credible [1] - 28:10 Crisaundra [1] - 129:2 Critical [1] - 105:25 critical [1] - 107:18 **CRUTCHER** [1] - 3:21 CSR [1] - 130:21 cubic [1] - 73:11 **Cup** [2] - 15:4, 55:3 cure [1] - 108:22 currents [1] - 81:8 cut [3] - 79:14, 79:23, 80:23

### D

**DANIEL** [1] - 3:23 data [5] - 21:8, 67:22, 81:17, 81:19, 102:15 date [14] - 17:11, 19:19, 22:17, 26:16, 30:11, 31:24, 32:5, 32:7, 32:19, 32:21, 32:23, 33:24, 86:12 **Date** [1] - 130:22 dated [2] - 26:15, 43:21 dates [2] - 9:16, 31:25 Dave [4] - 51:3, 63:14, 88:3 **DAVID** [2] - 2:8, 3:19 dawned [1] - 10:16 days [6] - 10:16, 18:2, 64:11. 64:12 de [6] - 76:10, 77:2, 77:20, 77:25, 78:3, 79:15 de-water [1] - 77:2 de-watering [5] -76:10, 77:20, 77:25, 78:3, 79:15 deal [2] - 55:3, 111:2 **DEBRA**[1] - 2:8 decades [1] - 73:7 December [15] -15:16, 16:17, 32:7, 32:22, 33:8, 33:21, 44:2, 55:16, 60:19, 95:15, 126:21, 126:23, 127:8, 127:10, 127:12 **decide** [4] - 7:7, 8:9, 40:22, 42:25 decided [1] - 90:11 deciding [1] - 41:4 decision [4] - 40:24, 105:25, 117:24, 121:5 decisions [2] - 11:8, 11:22 decrease [1] - 83:17 deem [1] - 103:25 deep [1] - 73:21 **DEFENDANT** [3] - 3:4, 3:14, 4:3 defendant [3] - 92:10, 92:11, 106:4 Defendants [25] -1:11, 7:3, 7:4, 8:5, 8:7, 10:20, 31:15, 33:15, 38:2, 38:4, 43:3, 88:19, 94:10, 95:8, 109:3, 110:19,

111:7, 111:13,

116:19, 118:20,

119:1, 119:15,

121:21, 123:8, 127:2 defendants [7] - 27:6, 31:11, 71:23, 74:7, 74:12, 117:15, 126:16 Defendants' [10] -100:16, 116:15, 118:8, 119:12, 124:2, 124:4, 124:5, 124:6, 124:7, 124:8 defense [2] - 36:23, 37:5 define [2] - 44:4, 101:21 defined [2] - 37:4, 94:14 defining [1] - 45:15 definition [7] - 62:23, 95:13, 101:20, 101:25, 104:11, 104:12, 104:13 definitions [2] - 62:22, 112:15 deliberate [2] - 122:2, 126:1 deliberating [3] -11:12, 120:10, 122:24 deliberation [6] -11:18, 38:25, 39:1, 112:14, 113:11, 115:8 deliberations [5] -11:17, 14:18, 113:17, 123:1, 125:8 deliberative [2] -119:5, 121:25 delivered [1] - 125:21 deny [1] - 108:5 denying [1] - 65:10 Department [7] -15:23, 30:1, 67:20, 69:8, 77:13, 79:20, 80:22 **department** [1] - 69:15 Department's [1] -43:14 deposit [1] - 55:25 deposited [3] - 22:7, 65:24, 83:6 deposition [3] - 58:18, 58:23, 90:20 **Deputy** [1] - 126:13 described [6] - 67:7, 79:1, 79:13, 79:20, 79:21, 80:1 describes [1] - 77:14 description [1] - 91:6 deserve [4] - 50:22, 92:23, 97:2, 121:12

design [4] - 53:5, 53:17, 53:23, 93:14 designated [2] -18:13, 19:1 designated.. [1] -91:17 designed [2] - 61:23, 92:25 designing [2] - 61:21, 61:22 despite [2] - 68:2, 118:11 detail [1] - 117:4 determination [4] -35:18, 35:22, 35:23, 36:21 determine [1] - 84:10 determined [3] -13:24, 22:17, 38:4 determiner [1] - 34:5 determiners [3] -32:12, 33:4, 35:16 determining [2] - 7:9, 8:11 developed [1] - 73:20 developing [1] - 54:18 dewatered [4] - 76:25, 79:2, 79:17, 80:18 different [10] - 11:3, 19:8, 19:12, 19:19, 36:20, 67:1, 79:10, 86:12, 93:16, 101:18 dikes [2] - 16:22, 55:14 diligence [17] - 15:11, 19:5, 20:9, 23:5, 23:12, 23:13, 23:22, 24:2, 24:10, 25:7, 25:8, 25:10, 33:11, 74:18, 119:14, 119:21, 119:23 dioxin [84] - 13:8, 13:14, 13:24, 14:2, 14:4, 14:7, 14:8, 14:13, 18:5, 18:6, 18:12, 18:17, 19:24, 21:16, 22:17, 22:18, 22:25, 26:4, 26:8, 27:14, 27:16, 28:16, 28:23, 29:16, 29:20, 29:23, 30:5, 30:23, 31:8, 31:17, 31:25, 32:4, 32:9, 32:15, 32:24, 33:3, 33:17, 33:19, 34:1, 34:8, 34:9, 50:11, 64:4, 64:9, 64:21, 64:23, 65:1, 65:21, 66:2, 66:5, 66:8, 66:9, 66:15, 66:20, 66:22,

66:23, 67:3, 67:24, 68:5, 68:8, 68:12, 69:1, 70:7, 71:1, 74:25, 75:13, 76:5, 81:16, 81:21, 81:25, 83:10, 84:3, 84:10, 84:17, 85:5, 85:10, 85:16, 95:10, 96:25, 115:15, 120:1, 126:18, 127:4, 127:6 dioxins [1] - 29:9 direct [1] - 30:24 **directions** [1] - 42:2 directly [5] - 37:6, 38:16, 45:18, 64:15, 71:2 director [2] - 28:21, 28:24 Discharge [3] - 49:10, 49:15, 49:18 discharge [12] - 14:13, 31:16, 33:18, 33:19, 51:21, 54:6, 63:12, 75:18, 94:16, 126:17, 127:5 discharges [2] -30:18, 37:16 disclosure [1] - 23:21 discontinuing [1] -59:21 discuss [2] - 91:21, 113:8 discussed [4] - 8:24, 8:25, 79:6, 99:6 discussion [12] - 6:11, 7:20, 9:8, 35:3, 37:13, 106:23, 107:9, 110:13, 112:5, 123:12, 124:12, 125:14 discussions [1] -91:18 displaying [1] - 124:3 disposal [26] - 15:18, 17:4, 20:2, 33:16, 49:17, 49:19, 50:6, 51:19, 52:4, 52:7, 54:4, 57:2, 57:5, 58:15, 59:21, 60:18, 93:6, 95:4, 95:7, 95:9, 95:16, 95:20, 96:10, 127:3 **Disposal** [1] - 50:4 dispose [5] - 14:21, 38:8, 48:4, 48:6, 52:4 disposed [1] - 20:3 dispute [7] - 13:2, 13:3, 13:5, 13:9,

13:17, 14:22, 46:6

disputed [1] - 30:20 disregard [1] - 26:10 dissolved [2] - 29:16, 29:23 dissolving [1] - 81:21 distract [2] - 42:24, 44:16 distracted [3] -113:17, 120:18, 120:23 distraction [9] - 40:11, 40:14, 41:4, 41:25, 42:9, 42:19, 42:23, 44:14, 114:20 distractions [3] - 40:9, 42:5, 113:18 District [2] - 130:4, 130:23 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:4, 1:11 **DIVISION** [1] - 2:18 division [1] - 20:2 doctor [1] - 77:5 document [13] - 21:6, 21:7, 21:20, 21:21, 47:6, 47:8, 47:11, 47:13, 47:17, 62:13, 103:9, 105:25, 112:16 documented [1] -43:20 documents [20] -14:16, 22:3, 22:9, 23:7, 24:6, 24:14, 24:18, 24:22, 25:3, 37:14, 62:12, 72:13, 72:25, 73:2, 77:12, 98:22, 106:5, 109:13 dollar [5] - 26:1, 27:1, 28:1, 34:22, 124:7 dollars [3] - 55:24, 92:3, 92:4 done [31] - 9:25, 16:15, 16:19, 21:8, 21:11, 30:11, 34:10, 34:17, 36:14, 43:5, 43:8, 45:2, 46:21, 47:24, 48:10, 49:19, 52:14, 56:5, 76:13, 81:1, 83:19, 84:9, 84:13, 92:13, 93:10, 94:1, 95:17, 97:24, 109:14, 119:24 door [3] - 80:25, 98:19, 108:6 doors [1] - 10:2 doubt [3] - 33:22, 72:4, 120:21 down [12] - 10:4,

29:18, 39:3, 39:11,

52:23, 54:8, 63:13, 65:25, 66:17, 74:14, 80:24, 122:19 downstream [1] -21:17 dozens [3] - 81:15, 121:18 **Dr** [63] - 15:3, 15:7, 16:10, 16:12, 18:3, 19:10, 27:9, 27:10, 28:13, 28:14, 28:19, 29:24, 33:25, 34:1, 43:2, 48:8, 52:17, 53:4, 54:17, 55:1, 55:10, 56:9, 58:18, 58:19, 58:22, 59:18, 60:3, 60:7, 60:13, 60:17, 61:1, 61:2, 61:5, 61:9, 61:14, 61:20, 62:5, 64:25, 67:3, 67:15, 74:20, 76:10, 79:15, 79:19, 80:2, 81:11, 81:12, 81:21, 82:7, 83:8, 84:13, 85:2, 85:12, 93:12, 99:10, 116:13, 118:3, 118:18, 118:24 draft [2] - 108:23, 110:9 drafted [1] - 110:16 drawing [1] - 77:16 dredged [8] - 27:8, 69:6, 70:9, 71:14, 80:23, 82:13, 87:11, 87:15 dredging [47] - 27:5, 27:10, 27:17, 27:21, 28:8, 28:11, 42:15, 43:4, 43:5, 43:8, 43:15, 44:1, 65:3, 65:14, 68:25, 70:8, 70:17, 70:20, 71:1, 71:5, 71:11, 71:24, 72:7, 72:9, 72:12, 72:14, 72:19, 73:7, 73:10, 75:3, 75:23, 91:8, 91:9, 93:21, 93:24, 94:1, 94:6, 99:11, 106:24, 107:3, 107:8, 107:16, 107:19, 108:2, 116:3, 116:4 dropped [1] - 74:14 **Drs** [2] - 31:4, 107:19 Duckert [1] - 19:22 due [17] - 15:11, 19:5. 20:9, 23:5, 23:12, 23:13, 23:22, 24:2, 24:10, 25:7, 25:8,

25:10, 33:11, 74:17, 119:14, 119:21, 119:23 dug [3] - 64:15, 65:15, 65:16 Dukert's [1] - 20:11 **dump** [1] - 16:7 dumping [2] - 16:3, 17:9 dumpsite [1] - 117:10 **DUNN** [1] - 3:21 during [17] - 7:8, 8:11, 18:4, 18:11, 19:24, 26:18, 32:1, 32:8, 32:16, 46:10, 58:23, 62:1, 63:3, 63:12, 63:23, 97:11, 97:12 duty [1] - 57:10

# Ε

e-mail [2] - 54:14 ear [1] - 10:17 earliest [1] - 63:4 early [3] - 61:16, 73:4, 76:11 **EARNEST** [1] - 2:7 earth [2] - 73:23, 80:17 earth-moving [1] -80:17 eastern [7] - 75:24, 76:18, 76:19, 77:1, 77:19, 77:22, 116:25 eat [1] - 110:10 eating [1] - 110:11 Edwards [1] - 97:23 effect [7] - 11:5, 48:15, 49:18, 61:21, 78:2, 99:18, 103:1 effects [2] - 11:24, 116:21 efficient [1] - 122:7 effort [1] - 25:22 efforts [1] - 43:20 eight [1] - 128:19 Eight [2] - 96:15, 127:14 either [2] - 13:10, 84:23 elected [1] - 114:9 elements [1] - 119:3 **elevated** [1] - 21:16 eleven [1] - 129:3 Eleven [2] - 96:18, 127:14 **elsewhere** [1] - 30:5 end [9] - 10:4, 15:15, 18:22, 22:20, 38:16,

53:2, 75:8, 105:19,

108:15 ended [3] - 58:16, 62:2, 95:21 Engineering [3] -16:11, 29:25, 30:2 Engineers [3] - 43:25, 44:1, 44:2 enjoin [1] - 119:1 entered [6] - 5:18, 7:21, 48:17, 112:6, 126:5, 129:13 entire [3] - 17:3, 104:13, 107:8 entirely [1] - 114:15 entitled [2] - 1:18, 43:22 entitles [1] - 87:7 entity [1] - 59:19 environment [7] -14:5, 50:16, 50:19, 88:9, 92:22, 97:1, 120:3 environmental [13] -19:6, 23:8, 23:12, 23:22, 24:3, 24:11, 33:11, 39:23, 48:15, 81:14, 88:18, 89:18, 119:22 ENVIRONMENTAL [2] - 1:6, 2:18 Environmental [9] -5:22, 7:1, 7:11, 8:4, 8:13, 30:2, 39:23, 42:14, 43:18 **EPA** [14] - 13:24, 18:6, 18:8, 18:13, 20:6, 20:24, 21:5, 21:11, 22:17, 28:21, 43:19, 43:23, 44:10, 88:17 equipment [2] - 64:16, 80:17 Ernest [1] - 12:3 erode [1] - 30:7 eroded [1] - 118:6 erosion [2] - 65:11, 81:10 escape [3] - 16:21, 61:23, 71:16 establish [2] - 51:20, 54:5 evaluate [10] - 68:17, 98:18, 99:9, 105:15, 106:2. 106:9. 106:19, 107:14, 107:16, 107:22 evaluated [1] - 99:19 event [20] - 49:21, 62:19, 62:20, 62:21, 62:24, 62:25, 63:1,

63:2, 94:19, 94:20,

94:21, 95:14, 101:10, 101:11, 103:23, 103:24, 112:19, 112:20 eventually [2] - 65:25, 80:22 everywhere [2] -61:10 evidence [79] - 7:6, 7:8, 8:8, 8:10, 10:21, 11:21, 12:23, 13:11, 13:12, 15:10, 17:10, 18:18, 22:14, 22:21, 26:10, 27:8, 28:8, 34:15, 36:15, 37:15, 38:14, 42:12, 42:17, 44:15, 44:23, 45:18, 45:23, 47:1, 48:12, 48:23, 50:12, 50:13, 57:9, 65:13, 68:3, 68:18, 75:18, 82:11, 82:12, 85:12, 85:23, 88:1, 88:6, 89:24, 89:25, 92:18, 92:24, 94:25, 97:19, 98:15, 98:18, 98:22, 99:10, 99:13, 99:19, 102:3, 105:16, 105:21, 106:2, 106:10, 106:13, 108:18, 114:23, 115:1, 115:3, 115:4, 118:14, 118:18, 118:19, 118:23, 119:19, 120:19, 120:22, 121:19, 121:22, 122:22, 130:7, 130:16 exact [1] - 21:2 exactly [10] - 21:21, 64:11, 77:15, 79:20, 82:21, 85:13, 87:11, 87:15, 102:20, 104:18 examinations [1] -63:23 examined [2] - 71:20, 124:19 example [2] - 51:22, 92:9 exceed [1] - 48:15 except [3] - 66:24, 87:11, 122:9 exchange [2] - 30:8, 30:13 excluded [1] - 108:17 exclusively [1] - 37:6 excuse [3] - 42:12,

54:16. 77:14

exhaust [1] - 65:24

exhibit [2] - 105:24, 123:16 Exhibit [15] - 8:24, 22:14, 65:21, 69:2, 105:22, 123:6, 123:22, 123:24, 124:1, 124:2, 124:4, 124:7 Exhibits [2] - 123:10, 124:8 exhibits [9] - 55:1, 79:22, 123:17, 124:19, 125:7, 125:20, 125:24, 126:4, 130:15 exist [1] - 83:17 existed [4] - 62:13, 68:3, 73:15, 79:1 existence [1] - 27:18 exists [3] - 54:10, 73:5, 76:17 **experience** [1] - 80:3 expert [14] - 20:21, 31:1, 58:21, 59:16, 61:3, 66:25, 67:12, 68:2, 78:12, 83:19, 90:6, 117:16, 118:8 expert's [1] - 116:16 experts [20] - 26:6, 27:9, 28:9, 43:3, 67:18, 68:24, 69:9, 69:17, 70:13, 71:7, 74:1, 79:19, 90:1, 91:13, 93:1, 99:20, 106:24, 107:15, 108:1 Expiration [1] -130:22 explained [2] - 40:1, 77:5 explains [1] - 102:21 extended [1] - 44:2 extensive [1] - 21:11 extensively [1] - 66:8 external [2] - 80:8, 80:14 eyes [1] - 26:10 F

facilities [1] - 25:3 facility [6] - 18:17, 22:16, 23:7, 23:17, 24:19, 34:3 fact [33] - 7:5, 8:7, 10:14, 36:10, 51:15, 51:17, 51:18, 52:7, 52:8, 54:2, 57:3, 61:15, 62:12, 72:7, 74:13, 76:23, 77:4,

77:8, 82:16, 89:12, 89:25, 103:10, 103:12, 106:21, 106:23, 107:18, 107:24, 108:10, 109:20, 115:20, 118:5, 118:19, 118:24 facts [6] - 13:16, 47:20, 75:18, 106:25, 107:1, 107:2 factual [3] - 109:1, 111:15, 111:16 factually [2] - 78:10, 78:11 fail [1] - 45:22 failed [7] - 48:21, 62:21, 63:1, 77:3, 94:20, 112:20, 115:21 failing [1] - 23:16 failure [1] - 57:7 fair [9] - 43:10, 44:14, 68:20. 104:24. 105:17, 106:7, 106:12, 109:25, 112:3 fairly [7] - 44:24, 68:18, 98:18, 99:9, 99:19, 105:16, 115:5 fall [1] - 38:6 far [3] - 20:18, 25:10, 75:9 fathoms [1] - 16:8 fault [1] - 93:3 February [12] - 28:16, 29:2, 29:4, 30:9, 30:14, 30:18, 31:18, 32:2, 32:16, 32:18, 63:4, 126:19 federal [3] - 11:13, 88:19, 112:25 fee [1] - 89:21 fees [14] - 34:13, 34:19, 35:7, 35:15, 36:9, 36:16, 91:24, 92:14, 92:19, 96:15, 121:3, 121:4, 121:10 fellow [1] - 69:7 few [10] - 8:23, 10:17, 39:4, 40:17, 47:19, 51:7, 63:13, 111:22, 112:10, 129:16 fibrous [1] - 79:8 fieldwork [1] - 21:8 figure [4] - 28:5, 32:25, 34:22, 89:1 filed [2] - 60:9, 99:12

files [1] - 40:2

filing [1] - 107:4

filings [2] - 19:5, 23:6 fill [2] - 37:21, 76:15 filled [16] - 10:1, 12:4, 12:6, 14:24, 17:17, 17:18, 75:24, 76:12, 76:14, 116:1, 116:8, 116:13, 116:17, 117:5, 117:8, 117:12 **final** [2] - 5:18, 10:19 **finally** [1] - 93:24 fine [4] - 5:20, 105:8, 105:9, 111:19 fingerprint [2] - 83:13, 83:15 fingerprinted [3] -65:2, 66:9 fingerprinting [7] -64:22, 66:6, 76:3, 83:18, 83:24, 84:3, 84:9 finish [2] - 51:7, 98:5 firm [5] - 34:13, 34:16, 35:14, 90:5, 91:23 firmly [1] - 67:22 first [21] - 31:14, 38:17, 39:9, 40:14, 45:25, 47:2, 47:20, 50:25, 51:2, 64:1, 65:10, 74:22, 75:21, 88:16, 89:7, 93:24, 94:15, 100:16, 109:20, 112:12, 125:19 **FIRST** [1] - 2:14 **fish** [2] - 25:14, 25:15 fishing [1] - 25:13 Five [10] - 18:15, 20:6, 20:24, 21:3, 21:10, 21:15, 21:22, 22:19, 96:12, 127:13 five [5] - 20:5, 20:8, 20:23, 43:21, 128:10 five-volume [1] -43:21 fix [1] - 9:21 float [4] - 75:16, 78:10, 81:6, 82:7 flood [2] - 37:12, 81:8 floods [1] - 37:13 Floor [1] - 130:24 **FLOOR** [2] - 2:12, 4:6 focus [2] - 107:17, 107:24 folks [2] - 50:24, 69:17 follow [12] - 12:10, 42:2, 101:15, 101:22, 102:8, 102:23, 104:7, 104:13, 112:15,

118:23, 119:17,

120:1 follow-up [2] - 119:17, 120:1 followed [1] - 73:7 following [24] - 1:19, 6:12, 6:20, 7:21, 8:20, 9:9, 31:15, 33:15, 35:4, 45:9, 95:8, 96:4, 97:4, 98:10, 100:12, 110:14, 112:6, 123:1, 123:13, 124:13, 125:15, 126:6, 126:16, 127:2 follows [3] - 6:24, 20:13, 23:19 foot [1] - 118:4 **FOR** [5] - 2:3, 2:17, 3:4, 3:14, 4:3 force [2] - 80:8, 80:14 Ford [6] - 58:18, 58:19, 58:22, 59:18, 61:2. 93:2 foregoing [1] - 130:6 foresight [1] - 37:9 forget [2] - 51:14, 72:21 forgotten [1] - 77:7 **form** [3] - 9:16, 17:7, 121:15 **formal** [1] - 104:3 **formally** [1] - 103:20 formed [1] - 115:22 **fortunately** [1] - 84:13 forward [4] - 29:4, 30:19, 30:22, 50:13 four [1] - 128:7 Four [9] - 36:25, 38:5, 38:12, 95:12, 95:22, 96:8, 96:20, 127:1 fourth [1] - 48:2 frame [1] - 21:8 Frank [1] - 25:12 frankly [1] - 75:8 front [1] - 87:20 full [2] - 115:15, 119:25 fulls [1] - 14:2 fully [7] - 68:17, 105:15, 106:2, 106:9, 106:19, 107:14, 107:15 fund [4] - 88:25, 89:3, 89:23, 111:6 funding [1] - 111:4 funds [2] - 111:10, 113:1

**FURTHER** [1] - 87:24

23:18, 25:7, 26:4

**future** [4] - 23:14,

G

gain.. [1] - 92:4 gaps [1] - 45:22 gauge [1] - 102:15 GC [5] - 5:22, 7:1, 7:11, 8:3, 8:13 GENERAL [2] - 2:18, General [3] - 49:10, 49:15, 49:18 general [3] - 88:25, 89:3. 89:23 generally [1] - 21:14 **generate** [1] - 113:12 generated [4] - 51:16, 51:23, 52:8, 54:3 generating [1] - 44:6 generation [3] - 51:25, 95:19, 95:20 generator [1] - 51:17 gentlemen [12] - 7:24, 9:11, 39:6, 45:6, 47:8, 52:23, 98:4, 111:22, 112:9, 122:21, 127:18, 129:14 George [1] - 36:12 GEORGE [7] - 2:8, 6:9, 6:18, 7:18, 9:5, 9:18, 104:21 GIBBS [2] - 3:5, 3:8 GIBSON [1] - 3:21 **GIUGLIANO** [1] - 3:9 given [16] - 12:19, 12:20, 31:24, 33:25, 42:2, 63:22, 68:4, 81:20, 86:21, 86:25, 102:7, 102:21, 104:6, 107:20, 120:16, 120:22 God [7] - 36:23, 37:2, 37:4, 37:6, 37:10, 37:17 government [7] - 36:3, 40:2, 46:19, 46:20, 51:13, 88:4, 112:25 government's [1] -56:18 governmental [3] -110:22, 112:2, 112:25 grade [2] - 48:3, 118:8 gradually [1] - 83:16 grants [1] - 5:21 GRAY [1] - 4:8 greatest [1] - 122:16 groundwater [5] -29:14, 73:21, 73:23,

74:13, 102:14

grown [3] - 122:12, 122:13 guess [1] - 23:10 guy [1] - 39:21

Н half [6] - 6:9, 12:25, 21:4, 41:18, 109:17, 118:4 hall [1] - 10:4 halo [1] - 83:12 hand [2] - 126:13, 130:17 handle [3] - 50:24, 108:21, 113:12 handled [4] - 11:9, 11:10, 11:11, 11:25 handling [7] - 16:14, 16:19, 17:1, 33:16, 95:9, 114:11, 127:3 hands [2] - 27:19, 114:8 happy [3] - 45:1, 111:20, 111:25 hard [1] - 121:11 harm [1] - 89:20 **HARRIS** [4] - 1:4, 1:8, 2:3, 130:1 Harris [88] - 1:20, 6:3, 6:18, 6:24, 8:2, 12:2, 12:4, 12:6, 12:19, 13:19, 28:18, 32:13, 33:5, 34:6, 34:13, 34:14, 35:13, 36:2, 40:18, 52:11, 53:4, 63:7, 69:20, 69:25, 70:2, 71:20, 88:9, 89:2, 89:13, 90:14, 90:23, 91:11, 91:12, 91:19, 93:15, 94:2, 94:5, 98:14, 98:17, 98:21, 99:18, 100:25, 103:20, 105:1, 105:20, 106:1, 106:9, 106:11, 106:12, 106:15, 107:14, 107:22, 108:5, 108:12, 108:16, 108:22, 109:10, 109:15, 109:22, 109:23, 110:1, 110:5, 110:16, 110:19, 110:21, 111:2, 111:5,

111:10, 112:1,

112:23, 113:1,

113:20, 113:22,

114:6, 114:8,

114:10, 120:7, 120:8, 122:5, 122:15, 123:15, 123:16, 124:15, 125:21, 127:16, 130:4, 130:23 hauled [1] - 52:19 Hazardous [1] - 28:21 hazardous [10] -13:25, 14:4, 14:6, 18:7, 18:13, 18:14, 22:18, 28:3, 33:3, 34:9 head [1] - 97:15 headquarters [2] -24:20, 24:22 health [1] - 102:13 Health [4] - 15:24, 77:14, 79:21, 80:22 hear [7] - 41:12, 60:8, 90:21, 91:7, 91:8, 97:10, 117:19 heard [49] - 1:18, 7:6, 7:8, 8:8, 8:10, 10:22, 10:23, 11:21, 12:23, 14:11, 14:17, 16:11, 19:20, 25:12, 27:5, 34:20, 35:19, 37:11, 39:21, 39:24, 40:16, 42:11, 44:23, 56:7, 60:25, 62:5, 62:17, 64:6, 65:23, 66:18, 66:25, 67:12, 73:19, 74:17, 75:19, 78:7, 81:11, 82:2, 82:9, 83:24, 87:13, 91:6, 91:22, 92:24, 92:25, 102:4, 102:5, 121:7 hearing [3] - 9:9, 35:4, 41:6 heart [2] - 13:15, 28:18 heavy [2] - 64:16, 80:17 heidi [1] - 129:5 held [2] - 1:19, 49:11 Helen [1] - 128:6 help [1] - 95:25 hereby [1] - 130:5 Herman [1] - 29:25 higher [2] - 103:5, 103:13 highest [2] - 20:1, 83:16 highlighted [1] - 18:2 Highway [1] - 102:14 HINTON [2] - 4:8, 6:7 hired [10] - 15:8, 36:2, 48:3, 48:5, 48:6,

58:20, 67:16, 68:2,

68:24, 69:9 hiring [1] - 15:11 hold [1] - 102:3 home [1] - 129:17 Honor [27] - 5:6, 6:2, 6:8, 6:18, 7:16, 7:17, 9:5, 10:10, 35:1, 45:12, 63:17, 87:23, 98:6, 98:13, 99:16, 100:15, 101:12, 105:9, 110:8, 111:1, 113:5, 123:8, 123:20, 125:10, 125:12, 125:17, 129:10 honor [2] - 36:1, 122:16 Honorable [1] - 1:19 hope [1] - 122:6 hopefully [1] - 97:8 hour [2] - 34:23, 92:9 hourly [1] - 36:17 hours [1] - 36:20 housekeeping [1] -129:16 HOUSTON [5] - 2:6, 2:12, 3:6, 3:16, 4:6 Houston [4] - 1:20, 43:17, 114:5, 130:24 **Hu** [1] - 90:15 Hu-huh [1] - 90:15 human [1] - 37:7 hurricane [1] - 37:12 hurricanes [2] - 37:13, 116:22 hurry [1] - 121:24 hydrophobic [1] -82:1

ı

i.e [1] - 59:20 idea [4] - 119:12, 119:15, 119:20, 119:25 identified [2] - 15:24, 123:19 identify [3] - 23:16, 60:4, 107:13 ignored [1] - 76:23 ignoring [1] - 72:19 imagine [2] - 68:15, 105:13 immediately [1] -66:17 imminent [2] - 33:18, 127:5 impacted [1] - 116:3 **imperfect** [1] - 46:14 impermeable [1] -

79:13 impervious [2] -116:20, 118:9 implication [1] -109:23 importance [2] -38:23, 40:12 important [24] - 11:2, 11:9, 11:16, 17:19, 19:12, 38:25, 40:8, 41:12, 41:24, 44:17, 45:19, 47:6, 47:11, 47:15, 76:16, 76:18, 77:25, 80:6, 113:9, 113:10, 115:8, 120:11, 121:25 importantly [1] - 48:21 imposition [1] - 38:20 **impossible** [1] - 76:6 impoundment [16] -65:2, 66:10, 66:11, 70:17, 73:9, 74:14, 75:24, 76:12, 79:16, 82:24, 83:2, 85:5, 85:11, 85:18, 116:2 impoundments [15] -18:24, 28:11, 29:4, 32:15, 34:3, 53:6, 53:9, 53:18, 53:24, 55:15, 56:23, 57:1, 71:2, 116:18, 116:25 impractical [2] - 16:2, 17:8 improper [2] - 102:11, 115:19 IN [1] - 1:4 inaccurate [1] -108:25 inappropriate [2] -98:24, 106:11 INC [4] - 1:10, 1:11, 3:4, 3:4 Inc [2] - 5:13, 5:14 include [2] - 5:22, 109:11 included [2] - 32:9,

115:19
IN [1] - 1:4
inaccurate [1] 108:25
inappropriate [2] 98:24, 106:11
INC [4] - 1:10, 1:11,
3:4, 3:4
Inc [2] - 5:13, 5:14
include [2] - 5:22,
109:11
included [2] - 32:9,
130:9
includes [1] - 104:14
including [5] - 28:23,
69:18, 80:21, 101:9,
103:22
incorrect [2] - 78:11,
111:5
incorrectly [1] - 75:23
increase [1] - 67:23
incredible [1] - 38:20
incurred [3] - 34:13,
34:16, 36:16
indeed [2] - 78:25,
92:19

indented [1] - 54:10 independent [4] -51:18, 52:3, 54:4, 61:2 indicate [1] - 22:9 indicated [1] - 22:3 indicating [5] - 65:15, 66:14, 66:19, 73:24, 77:19 indicating) [1] - 80:19 indispensable [2] -1:6, 40:3 industrial [8] - 14:13, 31:17, 32:4, 33:17, 33:19, 126:17, 127:3, 127:6 **INDUSTRIAL** [2] - 1:9, 4:4 industries [1] - 73:20 industry [1] - 18:9 **inefficient** [1] - 46:15 information [16] -68:24, 69:10, 69:16, 71:5, 72:6, 72:8, 86:6, 91:10, 93:16, 97:5, 107:16, 107:20, 108:1, 117:20, 117:24, 119:2 informed [2] - 99:2, 118:24 initial [1] - 111:21 injuries [1] - 88:10 injury [1] - 89:19 innocent [2] - 89:24, 90:2 inorganics [1] - 79:9 inquiry [1] - 75:9 inside [4] - 29:15, 30:8, 30:13, 66:11 insoluble [1] - 79:9 inspect [1] - 60:17 inspected [4] - 60:24, 61:4, 61:5, 61:6 Inspection [1] - 43:22 inspections [1] - 58:2 inspects [1] - 60:23 Institute [1] - 28:25 instruct [1] - 111:20 instructed [8] - 37:22, 51:15, 54:2, 58:13, 99:7, 101:2, 112:23, 113:21 instructing [2] -101:7, 102:1 instruction [37] -51:10, 52:22, 54:10,

89:6, 95:2, 99:4,

106:13

100:1, 100:3,

100:20, 101:1,

101:5, 101:8, 101:16, 101:22, 101:24, 102:4, 102:10, 102:16, 102:19, 102:23, 103:17, 103:21, 104:9, 104:23, 104:25, 105:5, 106:14, 108:22, 110:4, 110:17, 110:18, 112:1, 112:17, 112:21, 113:23, 113:24, 120:19 instructions [16] -8:22, 42:3, 44:23, 49:1, 50:3, 52:9, 95:11, 99:3, 101:15, 101:17, 102:8, 104:7, 111:22, 112:16 instructs [2] - 58:6, 58:12 intact [1] - 118:10 intention [1] - 6:1 interest [4] - 58:10, 106:6, 108:23, 113:16 interesting [1] - 58:19 interestingly [1] -51:12 interests [1] - 114:10 International [64] -6:19, 6:22, 7:4, 8:6, 13:7, 13:12, 14:6, 14:9, 17:13, 18:25, 19:4, 19:14, 19:15, 19:17, 19:20, 19:23, 20:9, 20:16, 20:18, 21:23, 22:5, 22:22, 23:2, 23:4, 23:6, 23:11, 23:21, 24:9, 24:17, 24:25, 25:5, 25:24, 26:6, 26:19, 26:24, 27:12, 27:25, 31:22, 32:7, 33:7, 33:9, 33:23, 34:11, 37:18, 38:6, 52:25, 53:1, 53:14, 54:16, 57:14, 58:7, 60:4, 63:21, 64:2, 74:22, 92:7, 97:23, 98:17, 99:2, 101:4, 123:9, 123:17, 126:22, 127:11 INTERNATIONAL [2] -1:9, 3:14 intervention [1] - 37:7 introduce [2] - 105:21,

introduction [1] -11:19 introductory [1] - 12:1 inundated [9] - 18:24, 26:17, 72:22, 81:4, 81:5, 81:8, 82:19, 115:23 **inundation** [1] - 30:25 investigate [2] -20:16, 118:22 investigating [1] -43:19 investigation [8] -17:12, 21:25, 43:20, 88:18, 109:4, 113:2, 119:17 Investigation/ Feasibility [1] -105:24 investigations [1] -44:6 invited [2] - 60:17, 60:21 involved [5] - 11:4, 61:21, 74:23, 93:13, 110:5 involvement [2] -53:22, 69:25 involving [1] - 81:16 **IP** [29] - 24:2, 24:5, 47:21, 47:23, 49:6, 50:7. 50:9. 50:23. 50:25. 51:1. 51:5. 51:9, 56:15, 56:17, 63:10, 64:15, 71:10, 72:3, 72:6, 72:8, 74:2, 75:7, 75:9, 85:12, 92:23, 94:24, 96:22, 123:15 **IPC** [1] - 24:17 irrelevancy [1] - 42:22 issue [22] - 28:24, 36:7, 36:8, 40:22, 41:24, 61:18, 64:1, 70:9, 70:23, 71:7, 72:1, 72:19, 72:23, 74:17, 76:9, 78:1, 99:15, 99:23, 100:16, 103:25, 108:7, 110:17 issues [21] - 7:7, 7:11, 8:9, 8:13, 11:4, 19:6, 19:7, 20:19, 23:8, 40:11, 41:4, 41:5, 42:24, 63:25, 81:16, 87:19, 99:8, 105:2, 105:11, 114:1 issuing [1] - 23:20 items [1] - 9:21 itself [14] - 15:19,

22:18, 48:7, 51:20, 54:5, 69:13, 73:8, 73:11, 73:15, 78:2, 78:4, 92:25, 95:4, 118:9

#### J

Jacinto [28] - 12:25, 13:18, 15:9, 15:15, 15:25, 16:3, 17:10, 17:12, 18:1, 18:5, 18:25, 22:25, 26:8, 26:18, 27:22, 28:7, 28:17, 29:21, 54:20, 55:8, 64:4, 64:9, 65:22, 66:1, 66:23, 84:11, 115:24, 118:12 January [2] - 60:20, 61:13 Jennifer [1] - 128:12 Jessica [1] - 128:21 jetting [1] - 80:17 Joan [1] - 19:10 **job** [2] - 45:2, 52:14 jobs [1] - 38:22 John [1] - 128:18 **JOHN** [1] - 2:9 johns [1] - 80:2 Johns [13] - 27:10, 43:2, 64:25, 67:3, 67:15, 79:15, 79:19, 81:11, 81:12, 83:8, 84:13, 85:12 join [1] - 119:1 joins [1] - 6:7 jointly [1] - 5:11 Jorge [1] - 128:9 **JPMORGAN** [1] - 2:5 judge [5] - 14:11, 47:4, 49:5, 50:16, 100:23 Judge [12] - 1:19, 47:9, 48:25, 51:24, 58:12, 88:15, 88:24, 89:5, 99:4, 100:1, 100:20, 120:17 judgment [5] - 5:18, 33:6, 35:14, 36:6, 122:14 JUDICIAL [1] - 1:11 July [6] - 13:22, 16:1, 17:6, 26:21, 30:21, 61:17 June [5] - 15:2, 16:10, 19:17, 26:16, 58:16 juries [5] - 101:15, 101:22, 117:20, 117:21, 122:14

juror [10] - 126:8, 127:21, 127:24, 128:1, 128:13, 128:19, 128:22, 128:25, 129:3, 129:6 JUROR [2] - 126:10, 126:12 Juror [4] - 128:4, 128:7, 128:10, 128:16 **JURY** [2] - 39:15, 63:19 **Jury** [2] - 31:10, 31:12 jury [58] - 6:16, 6:21, 7:21, 8:20, 9:9, 12:15, 12:20, 35:4, 35:10, 45:8, 45:17, 45:20, 45:25, 46:16, 85:3, 98:9, 98:11, 98:14, 98:23, 99:2, 99:13, 100:13, 102:4, 102:21, 104:4, 104:6, 104:9, 106:7, 106:8, 106:13, 106:25, 107:25, 109:10, 109:12, 110:11, 111:20, 112:6, 112:13, 117:25, 119:6, 120:13, 122:8, 122:23, 122:25, 123:2, 125:8, 125:18, 125:19, 125:21, 125:25, 126:5, 127:15, 127:17, 127:19, 129:15 jury's [1] - 124:9

#### Κ

**KAIM** [1] - 3:9 Karen [1] - 97:23 kept [1] - 5:10 key [1] - 62:19 Kidd [3] - 130:3, 130:21, 130:21 Kim [1] - 52:13 **KIM** [1] - 44:8 least [1] - 81:4 Kimberly [3] - 130:3, 130:21, 130:21 16:21 kind [6] - 69:12, 97:14, 102:10, 119:13, 119:17, 120:7 knowing [2] - 115:23, 118:20 98:9, 107:12, knowledge [3] - 81:2, 107:21, 122:25 94:2, 94:8 legal [16] - 49:5, 99:5, known [5] - 14:3, 100:2, 100:24, 26:20, 34:8, 34:9, 101:3, 101:6,

82:2 **knows** [1] - 72:25

# L laced [5] - 14:8, 19:24,

26:4, 32:24, 120:1

Ladies [1] - 111:21

9:11, 39:6, 45:6,

47:8, 52:22, 98:4,

ladies [11] - 7:24,

112:9, 122:21, 127:18, 129:14 land [2] - 49:21, 73:4 landowner [1] - 49:24 language [2] - 55:21, 94:12 large [1] - 69:5 last [11] - 10:15, 10:17, 10:18, 26:15, 51:8, 60:25, 97:3, 97:6, 110:25, 111:1, 123:25 lastly [1] - 9:22 latter [1] - 21:4 law [14] - 12:11, 12:12, 14:11, 14:14, 88:20, 90:5, 102:22, 104:10, 112:14, 112:25, 120:12, 120:16, 120:22 laws [1] - 55:21 lawsuit [13] - 21:24, 60:9, 88:21, 89:11, 90:10, 90:24, 98:19, 99:11, 99:12, 99:20, 106:16, 106:20, 107:4 lawyer [7] - 39:22, 56:18, 57:5, 78:5, 85:15, 91:23, 95:6 lawyers [14] - 46:11, 68:23, 69:11, 69:18, 69:22, 89:21, 90:7, 90:14, 90:17, 91:6, 91:12, 91:22, 92:22 layer [2] - 78:24, 78:25 learned [1] - 69:21 leave [2] - 16:16, leaves [1] - 109:23 leaving [1] - 83:14 left [10] - 10:17, 13:20, 49:15, 82:10, 82:14,

104:16, 113:25 length [1] - 30:15 less [1] - 103:19 letter [8] - 15:6, 15:17, 16:10, 16:17, 42:13, 42:16, 43:14, 55:16 **letters** [5] - 15:3, 55:2, 55:4, 55:9 levee [4] - 60:12, 60:16, 60:20, 60:25 levees [4] - 15:24, 30:7, 53:17, 60:14 level [1] - 73:3 levels [2] - 21:16, 67:24 levied [1] - 36:10 levity [1] - 103:19 Lewis [1] - 128:15 **LEWIS** [1] - 3:15 liabilities [4] - 23:23, 24:3, 24:11, 119:22 liable [6] - 7:9, 8:12, 51:21, 54:6, 89:10, 102:4 lieutenant [1] - 114:18 light [1] - 6:14 likely [1] - 29:19 limine [3] - 98:20, 102:12, 108:20 limited [2] - 101:10, 103:23 limiting [1] - 106:14 line [3] - 86:11, 87:9, 109:2 lines [1] - 20:21 liquid [2] - 16:16, 16:20 Lisa [1] - 128:3 listed [2] - 18:6, 38:2 **LISTEN** [1] - 44:8 listen [6] - 9:24, 10:6, 46:6, 47:4, 57:9, 97:13 listening [1] - 122:14 live [5] - 35:17, 35:21, 35:24, 36:20, 121:14 lives [2] - 38:22, 46:6 LLP [5] - 2:4, 3:5, 3:15, 3:21, 4:5 Load [1] - 43:16 local [1] - 40:2 located [5] - 12:24, 24:19, 24:22, 58:9 location [6] - 16:3,

16:12, 17:9, 24:23,

30:5, 85:3

101:10, 101:19,

102:25, 103:8,

103:9, 103:11,

103:12, 103:24,

locations [2] - 29:17, 31:5 Look [1] - 68:16 look [26] - 17:19, 23:6, 23:7, 25:3, 42:17, 46:19, 47:15, 52:12, 55:1, 55:16, 56:20, 57:7, 61:14, 65:22, 66:7, 70:8, 71:9, 72:1, 73:4, 77:12, 95:24, 99:23, 100:9, 105:14, 114:25 looked [7] - 18:19, 67:18, 70:22, 79:3, 81:17, 84:14, 90:14 looking [6] - 10:17, 19:5, 25:1, 67:21, 70:7, 121:25 looks [1] - 69:4 lottery [2] - 40:17, 41:8 LOUISIANA [3] - 3:6, 3:15, 4:6 Louisiana [1] - 28:24 low [2] - 20:4, 78:16 lower [3] - 73:23, 73:25, 74:15 lowered [1] - 73:25 Loya [1] - 126:14 LSU [1] - 28:25

#### М

ma'am [1] - 126:10 machine [1] - 1:21 mail [2] - 54:14 maintain [8] - 48:20, 48:21, 57:7, 57:11, 59:9, 59:17, 63:6, 63:8 maintaining [7] - 50:9, 51:2, 56:18, 56:20, 60:5, 63:11, 96:24 MAINTENANCE [2] -1:10, 4:4 maintenance [15] -25:20, 26:2, 29:2, 53:23, 53:24, 55:22, 57:14, 57:20, 58:1, 59:1, 59:6, 59:21, 59:25, 62:2, 62:3 man [2] - 61:11, 82:2 Management [10] -5:7, 5:8, 5:12, 5:13, 5:14, 7:1, 7:10, 8:3, 8:12, 46:24 MANAGEMENT [4] -1:10, 1:11, 3:4, 3:4 manner [4] - 16:15, 16:20, 33:18, 127:4

manufacturing [1] -119:25 map [1] - 85:3 Maples [1] - 23:2 **maps** [1] - 85:14 March [11] - 19:15, 20:14, 29:3, 31:19, 32:3, 32:17, 33:8, 33:21, 95:15, 126:19, 127:8 **MARK** [1] - 3:9 marked [1] - 100:18 marshy [1] - 20:4 Mary [1] - 128:6 mARY [1] - 2:21 mass [2] - 79:17, 80:21 material [59] - 15:19, 15:20, 15:22, 17:1, 17:5, 17:18, 52:19, 64:9, 64:16, 65:18, 65:19, 71:15, 71:16, 75:15, 75:25, 76:2, 76:12, 76:24, 77:20, 77:24, 78:2, 78:3, 78:7, 78:15, 78:19, 78:20, 79:1, 79:6, 79:7, 79:9, 79:13, 79:16, 79:22, 80:5, 80:7, 80:18, 80:20, 80:23, 81:5, 81:10, 82:4, 82:7, 82:10, 82:13, 82:14, 82:17, 82:21, 82:24, 83:3, 83:6, 86:3, 87:9, 116:8, 116:14, 116:17, 116:20, 116:25, 117:6, 117:12 materials [3] - 28:3, 54:19, 117:9 matter [10] - 5:25, 36:2, 36:11, 36:14, 43:4, 43:8, 72:7, 82:16, 108:8, 113:10 matters [4] - 98:7, 111:23, 112:10, 129:17 maximum [4] - 32:17, 34:7, 119:9, 120:14 Maximum [1] - 43:16 McGinnes [1] - 55:18 MCGINNES [2] - 1:9, mean [12] - 40:21, 41:14, 59:3, 69:11, 70:21, 77:13, 79:12, 80:4, 80:5, 83:11, 103:15, 108:3 meaning [3] - 94:14,

101:18, 101:19 means [10] - 37:3, 60:19, 76:19, 79:12, 80:7, 82:3, 103:7, 103:15, 115:24, 119:4 meant [7] - 9:22, 99:5, 100:2, 100:7, 101:3, 101:6, 103:11 mechanisms [1] -86:24 meet [1] - 48:14 MELANIE [1] - 4:8 member [1] - 122:13 members [2] - 120:13, 127:15 memo [6] - 16:1, 60:10, 61:17, 77:14, 79:21, 98:16 Memorandum [1] -16:25 memorandum [3] -15:17, 16:5, 17:11 memories [1] - 45:22 memory [3] - 117:18, 117:22, 118:2 mention [1] - 104:15 mentioned [5] - 40:17, 42:11, 62:7, 70:12, 89:22 mere [3] - 51:15, 51:25. 54:2 merge [1] - 23:14 merged [6] - 14:9, 18:25, 19:4, 19:15, 19:16, 19:18 merger [1] - 74:23 merging [4] - 20:10, 23:5, 23:8, 25:2 met [1] - 87:6 method [4] - 54:18, 54:20, 61:5, 61:6 methods [1] - 64:19 Meyer [2] - 19:10, 74:20 mid-'80s [1] - 21:6 mid-1990s [1] - 80:23 middle [1] - 115:14 might [7] - 11:5, 23:8, 25:2, 25:21, 36:19, 40:9, 58:23 miles [2] - 12:25, 16:8 military [2] - 46:2, Mill [11] - 18:15, 20:6, 20:24, 21:3, 21:10. 21:13, 21:15, 21:22, 22:13, 22:19

mill [28] - 13:17, 14:1,

14:3, 14:20, 14:22,

15:1, 15:9, 18:12, 18:16, 19:24, 20:5, 20:7, 20:8, 20:25, 21:2, 22:8, 22:11, 26:9, 27:20, 29:8, 29:11, 32:24, 34:2, 52:20, 56:23, 57:1, 74:20, 115:15 million [7] - 34:16, 34:19, 34:22, 36:16, 55:23, 92:2, 92:4 millions [1] - 73:11 mills [4] - 18:9, 18:17, 20:23, 20:24 **MIMC** [28] - 5:8, 5:12, 6:7, 7:1, 7:11, 8:3, 8:13, 15:13, 17:16, 18:21, 46:23, 48:6, 51:19, 52:4, 53:12, 54:15, 55:18, 55:24, 56:1, 58:5, 60:6, 60:12, 82:21, 87:10, 92:1, 92:20, 95:17 mind [3] - 30:23, 65:6, 102:23 minimum [1] - 120:14 mining [1] - 67:23 minute [7] - 9:6, 10:24, 49:2, 61:18, 89:22, 91:25, 100:21 Minutes [1] - 17:17 minutes [4] - 20:12, 63:14, 117:2, 117:4 mischaracterize [1] -76:2 mischaracterized [1] -76:1 mix [1] - 80:9 mixed [1] - 80:24 moment [6] - 5:10, 45:14, 53:25, 54:21, 99:22, 105:3 momentous [1] -11:24 moments [3] - 39:4, 45:15, 129:16 money [11] - 40:25, 41:3, 41:7, 50:22, 88:14, 88:22, 89:2, 89:21, 89:22, 92:23, 97:2 monitoring [3] -29:14, 58:2 month [2] - 10:14, 109:17 months [2] - 26:12, 43:7 Monument [1] - 12:25 moral [1] - 103:5 MORGAN [1] - 3:15

most [6] - 11:16, 47:6, 48:20, 54:21, 82:1, 86:17 motion [5] - 5:21, 6:8, 98:20, 108:20, 129:9 motives [1] - 115:19 mouth [1] - 54:19 move [7] - 5:11, 37:22, 38:16, 77:2, 80:17, 114:1, 129:10 moved [4] - 67:10, 80:7, 80:13, 80:24 moving [2] - 67:7, 80:17 **MR** [89] - 2:7, 2:8, 2:9, 2:14, 2:21, 3:8, 3:8, 3:9, 3:9, 3:10, 3:11, 3:17, 3:18, 3:18, 3:19, 3:23, 5:6, 6:1, 6:3, 6:4, 6:9, 6:18, 7:16, 7:17, 7:18, 9:5, 9:18, 10:10, 10:12, 22:13, 24:25, 35:1, 35:6, 39:13, 39:16, 45:12, 45:14, 63:17, 63:20, 87:25, 98:2, 98:6, 98:13, 99:9, 99:16, 99:25, 100:5, 100:8, 100:15, 101:12, 103:2, 103:4, 103:17, 104:1, 104:15, 104:20, 104:21, 105:1, 105:8, 105:9, 105:11, 106:17, 108:8, 108:25, 110:8, 110:16, 111:1, 111:5, 111:16, 113:5, 113:7, 123:5, 123:8, 123:18, 123:20, 124:16, 124:22, 124:24, 125:3, 125:5, 125:10, 125:12, 125:17, 127:16, 127:25, 128:9, 128:18, 129:8, 129:10 MS [14] - 2:8, 2:21, 3:10, 4:8, 4:8, 6:7, 111:12, 128:3, 128:6, 128:12, 128:21, 128:24, 129:2, 129:5 Muir [4] - 36:13,

124:21, 125:2, 125:9

MUIR [5] - 2:9, 124:16,

morning [5] - 10:13,

39:14, 39:15, 63:18,

124:22, 125:3, 125:10 **must** [7] - 33:6, 36:21, 49:5, 51:24, 60:24, 100:24, 108:5

#### Ν

N.W [1] - 3:21 name [2] - 21:2, 127:21 Nathaniel [1] - 128:15 natural [1] - 82:6 nature [3] - 17:3, 37:7, 37:11 **near** [3] - 25:15, 30:5 necessary [3] - 1:6, 40:3, 102:3 need [15] - 6:5, 9:11, 17:3, 31:1, 35:11, 37:21, 39:18, 39:20, 47:4, 63:25, 108:21, 110:10, 111:22, 112:11, 114:24 needed [2] - 14:19, 76:15 needs [1] - 5:16 negotiated [1] -109:17 **NELSON**[1] - 3:23 never [4] - 16:20, 59:19, 70:12, 72:10 next [7] - 8:23, 10:18, 32:21, 36:22, 42:19, 57:8, 80:25 nine [2] - 34:22, 128:22 Nine [2] - 96:16, 127:14 nine-million-dollar [1] - 34:22 **NO**[1] - 1:2 nobody [1] - 62:10 none [2] - 23:15, 71:22 normal [3] - 38:21, 38:22, 56:10 normally [1] - 40:8 northeast [1] - 67:4 northwest [2] - 28:9, 116:3 note [3] - 60:14, 104:21, 125:23 noted [4] - 16:22, 17:2, 67:24, 125:22 notes [3] - 54:15, 60:10, 118:2 nothing [41] - 7:18, 13:10, 14:7, 19:23, 20:7, 22:22, 23:11,

23:15, 25:25, 26:19, 26:25, 27:3, 27:13, 27:17, 27:20, 27:25, 28:4, 32:25, 34:10, 40:19, 42:21, 44:5, 44:7, 44:9, 46:21, 46:25, 72:12, 79:5, 88:5, 93:22, 93:25, 103:6, 109:9, 112:22, 118:20, 118:22, 119:13, 119:16 notice [3] - 5:16, 72:14, 93:24 notices [1] - 93:22 notification [1] -125:19 NOVEMBER [2] -1:15, 5:1 November [3] - 1:18, 52:16, 130:18 number [16] - 5:14, 5:15, 46:10, 46:11, 127:21, 127:24, 128:1, 128:4, 128:7, 128:10, 128:13, 128:16, 128:19, 128:22, 129:3, 129:6 Number [8] - 95:12, 95:22, 95:25, 96:1, 96:6, 96:7, 96:8, 96:12 numbered [2] - 1:18, 130:10 numerous [1] - 28:22

#### 0

O'Rourke's [1] -114:14 oath [1] - 119:6 object [2] - 35:1, 104:2 **objection** [1] - 94:2 obligation [1] - 63:6 obligations [7] -12:10, 57:14, 57:20, 59:1, 59:6, 59:21, 59:25 observed [1] - 25:13 obvious [2] - 60:23 obviously [2] - 12:16, 88:21 occur [2] - 73:8, 74:3 occurred [11] - 21:6, 49:21, 65:15, 69:1, 72:20, 75:4, 75:6, 77:22, 85:23, 92:13, 130:11 **occurrence** [1] - 37:5

offer [3] - 23:24, 24:2, 130:15 offered [1] - 130:16 Office [1] - 12:19 office [2] - 114:6, 114:7 OFFICE [2] - 2:11, 2:18 officer [1] - 20:1 official [2] - 9:13, 9:21 Official [2] - 130:3, 130:22 old [2] - 40:20, 124:5 Ole [3] - 15:8, 15:12, 15:13 Olympic [2] - 14:1, 14:23 omissions [2] - 9:20, 38:12 **ON** [1] - 1:5 once [5] - 5:15, 29:7, 79:16, 80:18, 81:3 One [9] - 36:25, 94:9, 94:22, 95:25, 96:3, 96:5, 96:19, 126:15 one [70] - 9:3, 9:6, 9:12, 9:13, 10:24, 11:16, 12:1, 12:2, 18:17, 18:19, 19:12, 19:21, 20:5, 20:24, 21:1, 26:1, 26:25, 27:1, 27:25, 28:1, 32:7, 36:11, 41:1, 42:10, 45:15, 46:2, 49:12, 55:4, 55:11, 55:12, 60:14, 62:9, 65:8, 67:16, 68:7, 69:3, 69:5, 70:5, 70:11, 70:24, 72:11, 73:7, 74:6, 75:10, 77:10, 77:11, 79:22, 81:15, 82:1, 85:14, 85:21, 96:14, 98:25, 100:9, 105:6, 107:11, 107:23, 108:8, 109:19, 113:9, 113:14, 114:25, 115:9, 117:24, 119:16, 121:2, 122:10, 127:21, 127:24

occurring [2] - 72:9,

October [2] - 43:24,

**OF** [11] - 1:1, 1:4, 1:4,

1:11, 2:11, 2:17,

2:18, 3:4, 130:1,

odd [1] - 69:12

72:12

56:8

130:1

58:1, 58:2, 59:20, 59:25, 88:22 open [6] - 107:12, 107:21, 109:23, 110:7, 126:2, 130:11 opened [1] - 98:19 opening [10] - 38:18, 42:10, 47:3, 56:24, 56:25, 57:6, 78:6, 85:15, 93:13, 95:5 opens [1] - 108:6 operating [2] - 14:25, 114:13 operation [6] - 16:15, 16:19, 17:3, 61:7, 65:4, 93:6 operations [6] - 57:15, 57:21, 59:22, 60:18, 60:21, 60:22 opinion [4] - 29:18, 31:7, 57:13, 65:3 **opinion..** [1] - 57:22 opinions [6] - 31:6, 70:16, 75:23, 92:16, 115:22, 115:25 opponents [1] -115:20 **opportunity** [7] - 10:6, 46:1, 46:4, 97:8, 97:21, 98:15, 98:22 opposing [1] - 124:20 Order [1] - 105:23 order [1] - 9:23 ordered [1] - 111:12 **ordinary** [1] - 101:18 organic [1] - 79:7 organized [1] - 14:16 original [1] - 93:14 originally [3] - 66:11, 73:15, 93:13 otherwise [1] - 38:8 Otherwise [1] - 96:4 ought [2] - 70:8, 106:17 outflows [1] - 21:17 outside [13] - 9:8, 35:3, 65:1, 69:22, 91:12, 98:10, 98:13, 100:13, 114:5, 114:6, 114:14, 123:2, 125:17 outstanding [1] -52:14 overreach [1] - 41:21

overreaching [2] -

overseeing [1] - 88:17

40:18, 41:9

ones [3] - 40:22,

119:10, 123:18

ongoing [7] - 34:11,

overstatement [1] -11:7 overwhelming [3] -65:14, 88:1, 94:25 **OWENS**[1] - 2:14 Owens [3] - 69:2, 69:18, 70:3 Owens' [1] - 114:15 own [31] - 26:10, 27:9, 49:21, 49:22, 52:11, 53:4, 58:9, 58:21, 59:2, 59:4, 59:7, 59:16, 60:1, 61:2, 61:3, 62:3, 63:7, 64:7, 68:23, 70:12, 71:12, 73:1, 74:1, 75:2, 78:12, 80:2, 80:8, 85:24, 90:1, 95:6, 116:15 owned [5] - 50:5, 58:8, 58:14, 58:17, 59:20 ownership [1] - 58:10

#### Р

P.O [1] - 2:19

Page [15] - 51:11,

51:12, 54:7, 54:11, 94:12, 95:11, 95:12, 95:18, 95:24, 96:1, 100:18, 105:11, 108:9 pages [3] - 8:23, 43:21, 123:25 paid [17] - 34:21, 34:23, 35:19, 35:23, 36:3, 36:5, 36:19, 55:23, 55:24, 58:21, 59:16, 61:3, 88:19, 91:25, 92:20, 121:6, 121:12 Paper [72] - 6:19, 6:22, 7:4, 8:6, 13:7, 13:12, 14:6, 14:9, 14:19, 17:13, 19:1, 19:4, 19:13, 19:14, 19:15, 19:17, 19:21, 19:23, 20:9, 20:16, 20:19, 21:23, 22:22, 23:3, 23:4, 23:5, 23:6, 23:11, 23:21, 24:9, 24:18, 25:5, 25:24, 26:25, 27:13, 27:25, 31:22, 32:7, 33:7, 33:10, 33:23, 34:11, 37:18, 38:6, 51:16, 51:20, 52:25, 53:1, 53:14, 54:3, 54:6, 54:16, 57:14, 58:7, 58:8, 58:13, 60:4,

63:21, 64:3, 74:22, 92:7, 97:23, 98:17, 99:2, 101:4, 123:9, 126:20, 126:22, 127:9, 127:11 **PAPER** [2] - 1:9, 3:14 paper [24] - 6:23, 13:17, 13:25, 14:3, 14:20, 14:22, 15:1, 15:9, 18:9, 18:12, 18:16, 19:23, 22:8, 26:9, 29:8, 29:11, 32:24, 33:10, 34:2, 52:20, 56:22, 57:1, 115:15 Paper's [4] - 22:6, 24:25, 26:6, 123:17 Pappadeauxs [1] -44:8 paragraph [2] - 54:9, 55:4 paragraphs [2] - 15:3, 15:6 parameters [1] - 22:1 Pardue [25] - 18:3, 28:13, 31:4, 34:1, 60:3, 68:7, 69:10, 69:19, 70:24, 74:5, 76:10, 77:6, 77:10, 78:13, 81:21, 82:3, 82:8, 83:8, 83:25, 86:12, 91:16, 93:2, 99:10, 99:21, 107:19 Pardue's [1] - 28:19 Parks [5] - 42:13, 43:14, 67:20, 69:7, 69:13 parlance [1] - 109:8 part [22] - 7:3, 7:12, 8:5, 8:14, 14:25, 18:11, 24:16, 29:10, 38:17, 43:16, 72:22, 74:23, 77:21, 81:4, 82:18, 82:20, 88:8, 109:12, 110:25, 111:1, 111:4, 111:21 participated [2] -21:16, 43:18 participating [13] -89:7, 89:8, 89:12, 108:11, 108:16, 109:21, 109:24, 110:20, 110:22, 111:3, 112:2, 112:24, 113:20 participation [4] -110:17, 111:6, 114:4

particles [1] - 29:9

particular [10] - 19:7,

22:10, 36:6, 38:24,

64:22, 86:17, 87:4, 92:10, 103:25, 115:13 parties [16] - 5:24, 6:15, 6:20, 11:2, 35:17, 43:12, 58:6, 59:13. 64:14. 67:14. 67:16, 71:2, 71:23, 88:17, 93:9, 130:9 partly [1] - 82:19 party [9] - 1:7, 5:23, 7:9, 8:11, 40:2, 40:4, 72:11, 89:9, 89:24 Pasadena [2] - 22:8, 22:11 Passaic [1] - 28:23 passed [2] - 49:16, past [1] - 90:4 **PAULA** [1] - 4:8 pay [11] - 12:11, 12:14, 14:15, 23:11, 23:15, 25:6, 25:25, 26:25, 27:25, 119:13, 119:16 paying [6] - 47:21, 49:6, 109:3, 109:7, 110:1. 110:6 payment [1] - 47:23 payments [1] - 88:20 Peanut [2] - 15:4, 55:3 peanut [1] - 15:5 penalize [1] - 85:20 penalized [1] - 72:16 penalties [19] - 25:6. 28:1, 32:13, 35:21, 39:2, 40:19, 50:20, 72:2, 84:25, 86:14, 86:15, 87:7, 88:25, 89:16, 108:14, 119:9, 121:5, 121:6, 122:3 penalty [28] - 12:11, 12:14, 12:18, 14:15, 18:22, 19:24, 26:1, 32:2, 32:11, 32:14, 32:16, 32:20, 33:5, 33:9, 33:12, 34:5, 34:7, 34:12, 36:10, 41:11, 41:18, 63:3, 63:12, 86:9, 88:20, 91:4, 119:11 penetrate [1] - 79:25 people [31] - 10:1, 10:3, 11:12, 12:6, 12:20, 14:4, 25:13, 25:14, 25:15, 25:16, 28:3, 36:1, 36:5, 38:21, 40:19, 44:4, 46:5, 46:7, 46:11,

53:11, 56:13, 67:14, 83:21, 85:11, 88:10, 114:10, 117:10, 117:25, 120:8, 122:1, 122:4 per [1] - 92:11 percent [1] - 34:17 percentage [1] - 35:20 perception [1] - 42:8 perfectly [3] - 72:5, 107:5, 111:19 performed [2] - 88:18, 125:1 performing [1] - 109:4 perhaps [1] - 78:23 period [19] - 10:23, 18:4, 18:19, 18:22, 19:24, 22:20, 26:18, 32:2, 32:8, 32:16, 57:18, 63:3, 63:12, 79:24, 86:9, 97:6, 102:9, 109:5, 111:4 permeability [2] -78:16, 78:21 permit [9] - 14:12, 44:1, 49:3, 52:6, 94:13, 94:16, 101:9, 103:22, 105:21 permit' [1] - 100:22 permits' [4] - 62:19, 62:24, 94:19, 112:19 permitted [10] - 22:24, 31:16, 33:16, 50:10, 51:5, 64:3, 74:25, 95:9, 126:17, 127:3 permitted.. [1] - 94:11 permitting [1] - 32:15 person [18] - 9:20, 38:2, 38:7, 38:13, 48:8, 62:18, 62:19, 62:23, 62:24, 81:15, 94:18, 94:19, 104:22, 105:6, 112:18, 112:19, 117:24, 122:12 personal [3] - 88:10, 89:19, 89:20 personality [1] -114:16 personally [2] - 92:3, 97:8 personnel [1] - 46:3 Peter [1] - 23:2 Peterson [3] - 15:8, 15:12, 15:14 Ph.D [1] - 81:13 **Phil** [1] - 29:24 **PHONE** [7] - 2:6, 2:13, 2:20, 3:7, 3:16, 3:22,

photo [1] - 25:18 photograph [5] - 8:25, 30:10, 48:2, 73:4, 116:11 photographs [1] -25:17 **photos** [1] - 65:8 phrase [3] - 101:3, 124:3, 124:5 phrases [1] - 47:16 physical [1] - 79:5 physically [1] - 67:10 picked [2] - 86:1, 86:12 pieces [1] - 121:19 **piping** [1] - 10:5 Pit [8] - 115:14, 115:15, 116:1, 116:7, 116:9, 116:12, 116:13, 116:14 pit [8] - 15:19, 18:1, 18:2, 28:11, 40:17, 41:8, 115:14 Pits [4] - 29:13, 117:11, 117:13, 118:5 pits [31] - 12:24, 13:18, 13:21, 15:10, 15:15, 15:21, 15:25, 17:17, 17:20, 17:21, 17:22, 18:1, 25:9, 25:15. 26:4. 26:7. 26:16, 28:6, 29:6, 29:23, 30:6, 30:8, 30:13, 30:24, 42:15, 61:8, 86:20, 86:21, 93:14 place [7] - 22:19, 38:20, 46:18, 61:7, 82:17, 85:9, 116:4 placed [9] - 34:3, 76:24, 76:25, 77:21, 79:16, 82:5, 82:14, 82:22, 87:10 places [5] - 66:10, 66:24, 85:16, 85:19, 120:4 plain [1] - 110:4 Plaintiff [1] - 1:4 **PLAINTIFF** [2] - 2:3, 2:17 **Plaintiffs** [3] - 5:9, 90:12, 123:5 Plaintiffs' [3] - 123:23, 123:24, 124:1 **plant** [1] - 20:3 **plants** [1] - 21:15 plate [1] - 47:24 played [2] - 20:13,

23:19 playing [1] - 41:8 pleadings [1] - 90:10 **plume** [1] - 65:18 POGGE [1] - 3:10 point [17] - 30:20, 33:2, 49:23, 49:24, 50:1, 57:24, 60:11, 72:22, 84:22, 85:9, 98:25, 99:1, 102:11, 103:19, 105:20, 107:21, 109:18 points [2] - 45:19, 109:6 **poll** [1] - 127:17 polling [1] - 127:19 Pollution [1] - 69:14 pollution [33] - 11:9, 11:10, 11:11, 11:14, 11:15, 11:24, 12:13, 13:23, 16:2, 17:8, 17:14, 26:21, 27:2, 34:8, 35:12, 62:9, 62:15, 90:18, 90:23, 91:1, 113:12, 113:23, 114:5, 114:7, 118:21, 119:18, 120:8, 120:11, 120:14, 120:25, 122:1, 122:4 pond [1] - 54:18 pool [1] - 14:2 pools [2] - 14:24, 119:25 PORTEOUS [1] -129:8 Porteous [1] - 129:8 portion [8] - 34:21, 69:5, 76:25, 77:1, 99:23, 102:24, 111:25, 121:6 portions [1] - 130:7 **posed** [1] - 42:5 position [1] - 113:22 positions [3] - 69:20, 91:11, 91:20 possibility [1] - 36:18 possible [1] - 84:2 post [6] - 57:15, 57:20, 59:12, 59:15, 62:2, 81:12 post-closure [3] -59:12, 59:15, 62:2 potential [5] - 25:1, 68:11, 70:7, 70:25, 86:18 power [53] - 12:18, 46:20, 48:20, 48:24, 48:25, 49:2, 49:3,

49:4, 49:5, 49:20,

49:25, 62:20, 62:25, 88:4, 94:19, 94:21, 95:3, 95:14, 99:4, 99:5, 100:1, 100:2, 100:6, 100:19, 100:21, 100:23, 100:24, 101:3, 101:6, 101:7, 101:9, 101:10, 102:24, 103:5, 103:6, 103:7, 103:8, 103:11, 103:13, 103:15, 103:23, 103:24, 104:14, 112:19, 113:23, 113:25, 119:11, 120:13 PowerPoint [3] -45:24, 121:18, 121.20 practice [1] - 56:10 practicing [1] - 46:9 pre [1] - 48:9 pre-approved [1] -48:9 precaution [1] - 17:4 prejudice [1] - 108:22 prejudicial [1] - 106:6 prepared [5] - 36:13, 43:23, 45:24, 70:15, 91:20 preponderance [1] -120:22 presence [5] - 98:10, 98:14, 100:13, 123:2, 125:18 present [8] - 16:3, 17:9, 36:14, 45:8, 68:18, 105:16, 107:23, 122:17 presentation [2] -13:6, 45:24 presented [8] - 13:12, 34:15, 37:15, 42:25, 82:12, 85:11, 106:7, 107:1 presenting [2] - 99:13, 106:25 president [1] - 19:25 presiding [1] - 126:8 **Presiding** [1] - 1:19 PRESIDING [2] -126:10, 126:12 pretty [2] - 58:18, 90:11 prevent [32] - 48:24, 48:25, 49:2, 49:5, 49:20, 49:25, 62:20, 62:25, 63:7, 94:20, 94:21, 95:3, 95:14, 99:5, 100:2, 100:7,

Reasoner [2] - 5:5, 5:7

100:19, 100:22, 100:24, 101:4, 101:6, 101:7, 101:9, 101:10, 102:24, 103:23, 103:24, 104:14, 112:20 prevent' [1] - 101:3 prevented [1] - 37:8 preventing [1] - 63:11 previous [2] - 23:12, 99:3 Private [1] - 16:24 private [1] - 15:16 privilege [3] - 63:20, 87:20, 122:16 probability [4] - 28:15, 29:19, 31:9, 31:20 problem [15] - 13:23, 16:2, 17:8, 17:14, 20:2, 26:21, 27:3, 34:9, 40:21, 42:16, 61:13, 62:1, 62:15, 93:7, 118:21 problems [6] - 15:24, 23:12, 23:16, 25:1, 33:11, 35:12 proceed [7] - 8:18, 9:4, 10:7, 45:11, 100:11, 112:9, 113:3 proceeded [1] -107:13 proceeding [3] -101:14, 113:11, 113:16 Proceedings [1] -1:21 proceedings [19] -1:19, 6:12, 7:22, 8:20, 9:10, 35:5, 45:9, 98:10, 100:13, 110:14, 112:7, 114:21, 123:2, 123:13, 124:13, 125:15, 126:6, 130:8, 130:14 process [32] - 5:16, 14:25, 38:8, 64:24, 76:10, 77:25, 78:3, 79:15, 82:20, 87:13, 89:7, 89:9, 89:13, 93:6, 108:11, 108:17, 108:21, 109:21, 110:18, 110:20, 110:22, 111:3, 111:4, 111:7, 111:11, 112:24, 113:2, 113:17, 113:20, 114:5, 119:2, 119:4 processor [1] - 117:23

produce [1] - 14:23 produced [4] - 1:21, 13:21, 14:20, 27:20 producing [1] - 14:1 products [1] - 28:4 professor [1] - 28:25 **Professor** [1] - 29:25 project [2] - 89:2, proof [1] - 130:16 proper [2] - 101:19, 102:7 properly [1] - 104:5 property [8] - 16:16, 16:21, 58:8, 58:10, 58:11, 88:11, 89:20, 94:17 protect [1] - 114:10 **protected** [1] - 46:3 protecting [4] - 50:15, 50:19, 92:21, 97:1 Protection [1] - 43:19 PROTECTION [1] -2:18 prove [5] - 50:13, 75:12, 76:7, 96:25, 120:20 proven [1] - 87:17 proves [1] - 88:6 provide [3] - 58:1, 108:1, 109:25 provided [2] - 121:16, 121:21 providing [1] - 109:12 proving [1] - 87:6 provisional [2] -105:12. 108:9 **public** [7] - 19:5, 23:6, 23:21, 36:4, 36:5, 93:22, 121:16 publicly [3] - 24:6, 24:7, 24:12 publicly-available [1] - 24:6 published [4] - 21:5, 21:7, 21:23, 22:15 pull [6] - 73:23, 99:22,

115:12, 116:6,

pulled [3] - 70:10,

pulling [1] - 73:21

punish [6] - 50:7,

63:10, 96:22

120:24

50:20, 54:23, 56:15,

punishing [2] - 89:23

purpose [2] - 14:18,

purposes [3] - 80:6,

123:23, 124:10

116:7, 117:1

73:12, 95:3

put [20] - 6:5, 13:17, 16:8, 21:19, 26:11, 27:14, 30:15, 43:3, 52:16, 66:11, 67:10, 71:6, 77:24, 78:9, 80:18, 80:20, 87:12, 87:15, 89:2, 98:22 putting [4] - 56:22, 57:1, 57:4, 65:10

Q

Q's [1] - 60:7

28:19

qualifications [1] -

**QUALITY** [1] - 1:6

Quality [3] - 39:23,

quarter [1] - 55:23

Quebedeaux [22] -

15:3, 15:7, 16:12,

48:8, 54:17, 55:10,

60:23, 60:24, 61:1,

61:9, 61:14, 61:20,

62:5, 62:16, 93:4,

93:12, 118:18,

Quebedeaux's [2] -

Quebedeaux...for [1] -

20:14, 20:23, 21:3,

21:10, 21:14, 21:22,

22:5, 23:20, 23:25,

24:3, 24:8, 24:14,

52:18, 53:5, 53:8,

53:14, 53:17, 53:20,

57:19, 57:24, 58:25,

59:5, 59:19, 61:4,

69:20, 70:2, 70:15,

71:14, 71:19, 71:22,

74:6, 74:12, 78:14,

questions [18] - 8:17,

31:13, 35:11, 37:1,

42:4, 42:5, 44:17,

44:25, 86:11, 94:23,

78:19, 83:1

115:25

questionable [1] -

9:1, 9:3, 24:15,

95:19, 96:21,

112:16, 124:18

quick [1] - 100:10

quickly [1] - 25:18

quite [2] - 38:14,

101:14

Questions [4] - 32:5,

36:25, 96:17, 127:13

16:10, 55:1

QUESTION [35] -

118:24

56:9

60:13, 60:17, 60:21,

42:14, 43:17

quote [8] - 100:18, 100:25, 103:21, 105:13, 105:19, 106:19, 108:15, 124:5 quote/unquote [1] -108:4 quotes [1] - 30:15

R rainwater [1] - 30:7 raising [1] - 44:12 range [5] - 19:19, 32:7, 32:19, 32:21, 32:23 ranges [6] - 31:24, 32:5, 32:12, 33:25, 37:21 rapidly [1] - 79:23 rate [4] - 36:17, 36:19, 36:20, 74:14 re [2] - 104:13, 104:17 re-read [1] - 104:13 re-reading [1] - 104:17 reach [1] - 117:24 reached [7] - 5:9, 6:15, 6:25, 8:2, 125:19, 126:1, 126:9 reaching [1] - 121:5 reaction [1] - 26:3 read [31] - 6:16, 6:21, 7:24, 7:25, 8:16, 8:20, 9:15, 14:11, 41:5, 41:7, 42:3, 43:12, 43:13, 48:25, 50:16, 54:9, 61:19, 88:15, 89:6, 90:10, 98:23, 100:6, 100:20, 104:4, 104:13, 105:5, 112:17, 117:3 reading [3] - 6:16, 101:1, 104:17 ready [2] - 5:3, 24:15 realize [1] - 17:2 really [3] - 44:19, 49:9, 83:24 reason [15] - 46:21, 47:14, 50:7, 56:14, 59:8, 59:16, 63:8, 63:10, 71:8, 88:2, 89:15, 96:22, 108:14, 117:21 reasonable [8] -28:14, 29:19, 30:17, 31:8, 31:20, 37:8, 120:21, 121:14

**REASONER** [3] - 3:8,

5:6.6:1

rebuttal [4] - 10:21, 100:11, 112:10, 113:3 **REBUTTAL** [1] - 113:6 receive [1] - 106:7 received [2] - 43:13, 90.9 recent [2] - 67:22, 67:23 recess [1] - 45:7 recognize [1] - 17:7 recognized [1] - 16:25 recognizes [1] - 85:19 recollect [1] - 40:7 recommendations [1] - 12:17 record [30] - 5:4, 6:6, 6:12, 6:13, 7:19, 7:21, 22:6, 29:1, 38:14, 100:11, 100:17, 109:12, 110:12, 110:14, 112:4, 112:6, 123:4, 123:11, 123:13, 123:14, 124:11, 124:13, 124:14, 124:18, 125:13, 125:15, 125:22, 125:24, 126:4, 129:13 Record [3] - 1:21, 130:10, 130:14 **RECORD** [2] - 1:1, 1:13 recreation [1] - 25:16 recreational [1] -25:14 red [1] - 18:3 redact [1] - 124:3 redacted [1] - 124:6 redactions [3] - 124:2, 124:4, 125:1 **REDDELL** [1] - 128:18 Reddell [1] - 128:18 reduce [1] - 34:16 reducing [1] - 34:19 Reese's [3] - 15:4, 15:5, 55:3 refer [1] - 48:22 referenced [1] - 62:11 references [2] - 42:11, 102:24 referred [1] - 15:21 referring [1] - 103:10 reflect [6] - 17:17, 29:15, 34:17, 34:23, 36:18, 117:18 reflected [2] - 38:9, 113:24

reflecting [3] - 17:24, 24:18, 31:6 reflective [1] - 34:7 reflects [4] - 90:1, 106:21, 116:11, 130:14 refrain [1] - 103:6 regard [4] - 19:7, 23:22, 25:20, 113:11 regarding [15] - 7:2, 8:1, 8:4, 15:18, 24:10, 43:15, 48:24, 57:15, 57:20, 100:19, 101:8, 103:22, 105:2, 110:17, 113:23 regular [1] - 52:12 regulatory [3] - 11:13, 57:25 reintroduce [1] -39:20 related [2] - 7:11, 8:14 relationship [3] -19:11, 19:13, 122:8 release [25] - 18:5, 31:3, 34:1, 34:11, 48:19, 49:25, 50:11, 50:12, 50:14, 51:6, 64:4, 66:20, 71:1, 74:25, 75:13, 76:8, 83:10, 84:17, 86:3, 86:20, 87:17, 94:15, 96:25, 119:16, 120:20 released [10] - 64:18, 64:23, 65:17, 65:19, 65:20, 66:14, 68:12, 69:1, 80:25, 84:19 releases [10] - 20:17, 28:16, 29:5, 29:20, 30:23, 31:25, 32:3, 32:9, 37:1, 64:8 releasing [4] - 26:8, 29:9, 30:6, 31:8 relied [2] - 91:19, 115:25 remain [2] - 7:4, 8:7 remained [3] - 82:22, 83:3, 118:10 remaining [2] - 6:19, 114:2 remains [2] - 87:11, 87:15 remarks [2] - 51:7, 93:13 Remedial [1] - 105:23 remediate [4] - 47:21, 47:25, 49:6, 87:14 remediating [1] -81:16

remediation [8] -82:20, 83:21, 88:15, 88:23, 109:5, 109:7, 111:11, 113:2 remember [25] -17:20. 19:10. 21:2. 21:18, 29:12, 41:17, 47:2, 47:4, 49:11, 54:25, 57:17, 58:23, 60:13, 61:16, 66:18, 74:20, 76:10, 76:17, 81:13, 86:1, 95:18, 102:1, 106:4. 115:14, 115:16 remind [2] - 16:14, 74:18 removal [2] - 109:4, 113:2 Removal [1] - 105:25 remove [1] - 123:25 removing [1] - 61:7 reopen [1] - 98:15 repair [1] - 30:11 repaired [3] - 16:23, 60:12, 60:16 repairs [1] - 60:20 repeat [4] - 16:24, 44:21, 113:9, 113:14 repetitious [1] - 10:22 report [5] - 43:21, 44:6, 71:4, 116:16, 118:22 Report' [1] - 43:23 reported [2] - 1:21, 130:12 Reporter [2] - 130:3, 130:22 reporter [2] - 9:9, 35:4 Reporter's [3] - 1:21, 130:9, 130:13 REPORTER'S [2] -1:1. 1:13 reports [1] - 91:19 represent [2] - 36:1, 63:21 representative [2] -22:6. 23:3 representatives [1] -19:21 represented [2] -106:18, 107:3 representing [2] -39:22, 101:13 represents [1] -113:15 Request [1] - 17:7 request [9] - 6:2, 44:22, 61:18, 62:6, 62:7, 98:21, 100:25,

108:6, 119:2

requested [2] - 43:24, 130:8 requesting [2] -103:21, 110:18 requests [1] - 105:20 require [1] - 113:1 required [10] - 10:25, 12:12, 14:14, 48:11, 48:13, 55:20, 56:8, 88:19, 119:5, 125:25 requirement [3] -57:25, 58:3, 62:3 requirements [3] -59:12, 59:15, 62:3 requires [2] - 49:3, 100:22 reread [1] - 104:11 Research [2] - 28:21, 28:25 Reserves [1] - 114:18 residents [1] - 120:9 resolved [1] - 5:25 **Resources** [1] - 28:25 respect [12] - 26:20, 27:7, 27:13, 27:16, 27:20, 28:2, 33:14, 35:10, 35:15, 78:14, 100:15, 115:10 respond [4] - 98:23, 106:1, 110:24, 121:20 response [6] - 97:16, 98:16, 99:16, 106:3, 106:12, 118:20 responsibilities [2] -114:24, 114:25 responsibility [5] -28:2, 56:1, 60:5, 62:1, 121:1 responsible [20] -12:5, 12:8, 38:3, 50:9, 51:1, 51:24, 55:11, 55:13, 56:17, 56:19, 61:20, 63:11, 67:23, 74:8, 74:13, 75:3, 75:5, 89:24, 90:23, 96:23 responsibly [1] -47:18 restraint [1] - 102:15 result [2] - 12:11, 27:4 results [3] - 29:14, 30:4, 78:16 resume [3] - 60:22, 60:23, 81:12 resumed [1] - 60:18 retained [2] - 90:4, 90:6

retire [2] - 122:23,

129:15

retired [1] - 114:17 reveal [1] - 83:2 review [16] - 11:21, 12:23, 13:11, 14:18, 21:20, 22:2, 24:14, 24:18, 24:22, 28:19, 48:13, 55:2, 81:19, 107:19, 120:2, 121:23 reviewed [3] - 24:6, 29:13, 106:15 **Rice** [2] - 29:25, 30:2 rid [1] - 14:20 rightly [1] - 12:21 risk [1] - 34:23 river [36] - 13:9, 13:14, 13:20, 14:9, 16:21, 22:23, 25:16, 28:17, 29:18, 30:7, 30:9, 30:13, 30:25, 31:2, 61:24, 65:20, 65:25, 66:14, 67:8, 69:2, 70:10, 73:3, 73:8, 73:10, 73:12, 73:14, 73:25, 76:5, 81:1, 81:22, 84:22, 85:4, 85:7, 85:10, 86:4, 116:21 River [27] - 13:18, 15:9, 15:25, 16:4, 17:10, 17:12, 18:1, 18:5, 18:25, 23:1, 26:8, 26:18, 27:22, 28:7, 28:17, 28:23, 29:21, 54:20, 55:8, 64:4, 64:10, 65:22, 66:2, 66:24, 84:11, 115:24, 118:12 riverbanks [1] - 25:9 **ROBIN** [1] - 3:8 Rock [1] - 69:2 rOCK [1] - 2:14 Rodriguez [1] - 36:13 roll [1] - 51:9 Ronald [1] - 129:8 room [5] - 42:1, 45:20, 112:14, 122:23, 129:15 **ROSS** [1] - 3:11 roughly [1] - 92:2 routine [1] - 38:22 Ruiz [1] - 25:12 rules [1] - 49:8 rulings [1] - 102:13 run [3] - 14:22, 14:23, 25:18 runs [2] - 13:14, 28:18 Ryan [3] - 114:8, 114:9, 114:17

**RYAN** [1] - 2:11

Ryan's [1] - 114:14 S sadly [1] - 68:22 **SALDANA** [1] - 128:21 **Saldana** [1] - 128:21 sample [1] - 66:4 samples [3] - 82:20, 83:2. 83:5 sampling [5] - 29:17, 29:22, 30:4, 31:5, 43:15 **samplings** [1] - 31:7 San [28] - 12:25, 13:18, 15:9, 15:14, 15:25, 16:3, 17:10, 17:12, 17:25, 18:5, 18:25, 22:25, 26:8, 26:18, 27:22, 28:7, 28:17, 29:20, 54:19, 55:8, 64:4, 64:9, 65:22, 66:1, 66:23, 84:11, 115:23, 118:11 sand [6] - 64:18, 65:4, 65:17. 66:12. 67:23. 73:11 sat [1] - 48:7 satisfactory [1] -54:21 **saw** [1] - 72:13 **SCC** [1] - 24:6 **SCHMIDT** [1] - 128:6 Schmidt [1] - 128:6 **SCHRADER** [5] - 3:19, 63:17, 63:20, 99:9, 106:17 Schrader [5] - 51:3, 63:16, 97:19, 101:13, 107:12 science [3] - 83:11, 83:25 Science [1] - 30:2 scientific [7] - 28:15, 29:19, 30:17, 31:9, 64:19, 76:4, 84:5 scientifically [2] -66:3, 81:22 scientist [1] - 81:14 scientists [1] - 64:21 scooped [1] - 71:15 scope [1] - 11:4 sea [1] - 16:7 seat [1] - 10:3 seated [7] - 7:23, 45:10, 98:12,

100:14, 110:15,

112:8, 126:7

seats [1] - 10:1

123:8, 123:20,

second [10] - 6:9, 42:10, 43:9, 51:4, 52:2, 73:18, 96:9, 104:22, 112:4 section [4] - 76:18, 76:19, 77:20, 77:23 sections [1] - 76:11 sediments [1] - 43:16 see [25] - 8:23, 18:10, 23:7, 24:17, 24:21, 28:8, 46:23, 47:7, 47:12, 47:14, 54:7, 55:17, 64:23, 65:9, 65:18, 66:12, 83:10, 83:12, 83:14, 91:8, 96:2, 116:11, 116:15 seeking [5] - 34:18, 35:7, 40:15, 93:4, seepage [2] - 15:24, 60:15 segregate [1] - 92:13 selection [3] - 45:17, 46:1, 93:5 sending [1] - 67:8 **sense** [1] - 79:3 sensitive [1] - 17:3 sent [2] - 42:17, 70:10 sentence [3] - 104:22, 105:5, 109:20 separate [2] - 5:14, 92:11 separated [1] - 64:17 separation [3] - 65:4, 65:17, 66:12 **September** [4] - 32:19, 32:21, 38:1, 43:22 seriously [2] - 13:4, 13:17 seriousness [1] -103:20 serve [1] - 117:9 served [2] - 36:5, 121:16 service [12] - 36:4, 36:5, 46:2, 46:5, 46:7, 46:8, 46:17, 97:9, 121:15, 121:16, 122:18, 129:15 set [6] - 36:17, 77:8, 119:11, 120:13, 120:25, 122:4 setting [1] - 19:8 settled [3] - 7:11, 8:13, 46:24 **settlement** [7] - 5:9, 6:14, 6:25, 7:5, 8:1, 8:3. 8:8 seven [3] - 49:16,

49:17, 128:16 Seven [2] - 96:13, 127:14 sever [2] - 5:11, 5:21 several [1] - 117:25 Several [1] - 92:4 **severance** [1] - 5:23 shall [2] - 7:6, 8:9 Ship [1] - 43:17 short [3] - 58:18, 79:24, 97:5 **shorter** [1] - 39:9 show [4] - 47:1, 50:14, 64:5, 78:16 showed [5] - 21:15, 83:18, 84:14, 85:15, 102:15 showing [3] - 25:19, 28:5, 29:23 **shown** [5] - 30:10, 54:14, 118:18, 125:20 shows [3] - 29:12, 77:18, 83:21 side [5] - 66:17, 66:18, 77:10, 77:11, 107:7 sign [1] - 27:14 signed [1] - 127:15 similar [1] - 102:16 simple [2] - 115:4, 115:6 simply [3] - 28:20, 42:1, 115:21 sincere [1] - 121:3 single [5] - 41:6, 85:9, 85:22, 85:24, 119:16 sink [1] - 65:25 sipocz [1] - 67:21 sit [5] - 39:3, 39:11, 52:23, 63:13, 122:19 site [130] - 13:3, 13:23, 16:12, 18:20, 19:1, 19:2, 19:7, 20:8, 20:17, 20:20, 21:24, 22:1, 22:7, 22:10, 22:21, 25:21, 25:22, 26:20, 26:22, 27:7, 27:10, 27:14, 27:16, 27:17, 27:19, 30:20, 34:9, 43:19, 44:11, 47:21, 47:25, 48:9, 48:19, 48:20, 49:6, 50:9, 51:2, 52:20, 53:6, 53:9, 55:25, 56:18, 56:20, 57:4, 57:15, 57:20, 58:1, 58:15, 59:2, 59:4, 59:7, 59:9, 59:13, 59:17, 59:20, 59:22, 59:25, 61:13, 61:22,

63:12, 64:10, 64:15, 64:22, 64:24, 65:15, 65:20, 66:21, 67:4, 67:24, 68:6, 68:9, 68:12, 69:1, 69:6, 70:8, 70:9, 71:15, 71:16, 71:17, 72:20, 72:22, 72:24, 73:1, 73:5, 73:12, 73:14, 73:24, 74:19, 75:6, 75:14, 76:6, 76:14, 76:24, 77:1, 79:2, 80:18, 80:20, 80:25, 81:4, 81:22, 82:10, 82:14, 82:17, 82:18, 83:10, 83:14, 83:21, 84:17, 86:3, 87:10, 87:14, 88:22, 89:14, 92:25, 93:5, 94:1, 94:6. 96:24. 108:13. 109:5, 111:7, 115:23, 116:3, 117:5, 118:21, 124:5 Site [2] - 43:22, 58:8 sites [4] - 25:13, 28:22, 60:5, 81:15 sitting [3] - 90:18, 92:8, 114:9 situation [2] - 103:20, 119:19 Six [2] - 96:13, 127:13 six [1] - 128:13 **skip** [1] - 38:15 Slide [8] - 115:12, 116:7, 116:9, 117:1, 117:10, 117:13, 118:13, 118:16 slide [2] - 29:12, 116:6 slides [2] - 121:18, 121:20 slow [1] - 46:14 slowly [1] - 43:12 sludge [40] - 13:2, 13:8, 13:13, 13:18, 13:21, 13:23, 14:1, 14:4, 14:7, 14:8, 14:24, 15:18, 15:22, 16:7, 16:9, 17:1, 17:18, 18:12, 18:16, 18:21, 19:24, 20:3, 22:16, 22:23, 22:25, 25:9, 26:4, 26:9, 27:19, 29:5, 29:8, 32:24, 34:2, 56:23, 57:1, 57:8, 61:8, 80:12, 115:15, 120:1 smashed [1] - 78:24 Smith [1] - 128:12 **SMITH** [2] - 2:21, 128:12

sold [1] - 74:20 solely [5] - 9:19, 37:2, 37:16, 38:12 solid [9] - 33:17, 33:19, 38:3, 38:9, 79:17, 80:21, 95:10, 127:3, 127:6 **Solid** [1] - 50:4 solidify [1] - 79:23 **solids** [4] - 29:10, 29:11, 79:8, 82:4 someone [3] - 56:4, 80:23, 84:2 somewhere [1] -14:21 sorry [3] - 5:13, 32:6, 60:2 sort [4] - 21:24, 65:10, 109:23, 120:2 sorts [1] - 65:23 sought [2] - 88:14, 93:10 sound [2] - 44:7, 44:8 source [1] - 84:11 sources [2] - 65:23, 66:22 south [1] - 124:3 space [1] - 76:15 speaking [1] - 122:14 special [2] - 17:4, 101:24 specific [7] - 37:25, 85:3, 85:7, 86:5, 86:8, 107:13, 115:10 specifically [3] -16:17, 100:18, 107:7 spend [1] - 82:23 spent [2] - 75:11, 80:4 SPERANDEO [1] -129:5 **Sperandeo** [1] - 129:5 **Spill** [3] - 7:12, 8:14, 49:14 **spoken** [1] - 121:9 spreading [1] - 65:18 stakeholder [3] -110:23, 112:2, 112:25 stand [10] - 19:11, 39:10, 39:16, 46:19, 79:14, 88:3, 88:5, 91:23, 92:3, 106:8 standards [1] - 48:15 **standing** [1] - 10:2 **standpoint** [1] - 58:1 stands [1] - 79:23 STANFIELD [12] -3:18, 7:17, 101:12, 103:2, 104:1,

108:25, 111:1,

124:24, 125:5, 125:12 stanfield [1] - 125:4 Stanfield [3] - 123:7. 124:23, 125:11 start [3] - 39:1, 76:9, 127:23 started [1] - 83:16 **starting** [5] - 28:15, 30:9, 30:14, 63:3, 115:24 starts [1] - 16:5 State [10] - 5:16, 14:14, 15:23, 33:20, 67:20, 77:13, 79:20, 80:21, 127:7, 130:5 **STATE** [3] - 1:4, 2:17, 130:1 state [7] - 6:22, 11:10, 11:13, 12:13, 31:18, 39:23, 126:18 State's [2] - 88:25, 113:15 statement [13] - 43:9, 56:24, 56:25, 57:6, 85:15, 86:22, 95:5, 100:17, 108:18, 109:1, 111:15, 111:17 **statements** [2] - 47:3, 78:6 states [3] - 16:1, 101:16, 112:1 States [2] - 43:18, 43:25 stating [1] - 110:19 **STATION** [1] - 2:19 Statute [3] - 49:10, 49:16, 49:18 statute [8] - 7:10, 8:12, 41:18, 41:19, 49:14, 49:16, 96:9, 96:10 statutes [5] - 49:11, 49:12, 89:10, 89:16, 108:15 statutory [1] - 5:16 stenotype [1] - 1:21 stepped [1] - 47:23 still [7] - 28:6, 46:21, 46:22, 46:25, 76:2, 81:3. 83:3 **stipulation** [18] - 6:15, 6:20, 6:24, 7:13, 7:14, 7:25, 43:11, 44:10, 47:20, 50:16, 88:16, 109:3, 109:6, 109:9, 109:11, 109:15, 109:16

50:1

stood [1] - 56:19 stop [11] - 13:8, 13:13, 14:7, 22:23, 32:25, 33:1, 34:11, 75:5, 93:22, 94:6, 113:23 stopped [1] - 93:25 stopping [1] - 27:16 store [1] - 38:8 storing [1] - 54:19 storm [1] - 37:12 storms [1] - 116:21 story [3] - 68:20, 105:18. 107:7 straight [1] - 55:21 **STRAWN** [1] - 4:5 STREET [3] - 2:5, 3:15, 4:6 stress [2] - 38:19, 38:23 stretch [1] - 39:11 strongly [1] - 12:17 studies [2] - 18:15, 20:6 study [7] - 18:9, 18:11, 18:12, 20:8, 21:6, 21:11 **Study** [11] - 20:6, 20:24, 21:3, 21:10, 21:13, 21:15, 21:22, 22:13, 22:19, 43:17, 105:24 stuff [1] - 66:16 styled [1] - 130:10 submerge [2] - 26:12, submerged [4] -18:24, 26:7, 26:17, 30:21 submit [6] - 32:14, 34:6, 34:15, 98:16, 108:23, 110:9 submitted [2] - 43:23, 104:10 subsided [2] - 74:19, 87:12 subsidence [11] -37:10, 73:19, 74:3, 74:7, 74:8, 74:10, 75:6, 117:15, 117:17, 118:3, 118:4 subsides [1] - 73:23 substance [6] - 18:7, 18:14, 22:18, 33:3, 34:10, 118:10 Substance [1] - 28:21 substantive [1] -114:1 sucked [1] - 74:14 suffer [12] - 12:13, 14:12, 49:2, 52:6,

94:13, 94:16, 95:13, 96:24, 100:22, 101:8, 103:22, 120:24 suffered [11] - 22:24, 31:16, 33:15, 50:10,

51:16, 53:15, 50:10, 51:5, 64:3, 74:24, 94:10, 95:9, 126:16, 127:2 suffers [6] - 62:18, 62:24, 94:18

62:24, 94:18, 104:22, 105:7, 112:18 sufficient [3] - 51:20, 54:5, 81:9

**suggest** [6] - 25:4, 25:23, 26:5, 26:23, 27:23, 118:23

suggested [2] -107:22, 118:24 suggesting [5] -65:11, 106:10, 110:6, 116:20, 117:15

suggestion [6] -28:10, 42:20, 109:25, 114:3, 114:12, 116:23 suggestions [1] -

12:16 suit [2] - 40:2, 91:1 SUITE [2] - 3:6, 3:15 summarize [1] - 45:19 summarizes [1] -

14:12 **sun** [1] - 83:13 **Superfund** [19] - 19:2, 20:19, 28:22, 44:11, 89:7, 89:9, 89:13, 108:11, 108:17, 108:21, 109:21, 110:18, 110:20,

110:22, 111:3, 111:7, 112:24, 113:20

**support** [3] - 72:2, 75:19, 84:15 **supported** [4] - 29:18, 31:6, 31:7, 81:23 **supposed** [2] - 91:14, 91:15

supposition [1] -119:12 surface [1] - 73:22 survey [5] - 18:23,

26:15, 27:3, 115:17, 115:21 suspect [1] - 92:5 suspend [1] - 44:1 suspended [2] - 29:10 **swimming** [3] - 14:1, 14:23, 119:25 **SYDNEY** [1] - 3:10 **system** [5] - 46:13, 46:16, 77:8, 117:25

# Т

talks [1] - 41:2 task [2] - 22:3, 120:24 tasked [1] - 31:13 TCEQ [31] - 6:4, 6:19, 6:22, 6:25, 8:2, 39:24, 40:1, 40:3, 40:6, 40:10, 40:18, 40:24, 41:3, 41:7, 41:8, 41:13, 41:17, 41:18, 42:1, 42:21, 42:23, 43:6, 43:13, 43:15, 43:23, 43:24, 44:7, 44:13, 44:16, 113:15 TCRA [1] - 98:16 technically [2] - 5:23, 104:23 technique [1] - 76:4 technology [1] - 84:6 **telephone** [1] - 54:15 Ten [2] - 96:17, 127:14 ten [2] - 127:15, 128:25 tendency [1] - 82:6 tendered [1] - 130:15 terms [6] - 5:9, 78:20, 79:4, 119:9, 120:7, 121:10 test [4] - 66:1, 78:15, 97:18 tested [3] - 66:8, 66:20, 85:17 testified [23] - 19:10, 19:22, 19:25, 23:3, 23:4, 28:14, 29:1, 29:17, 29:22, 30:16, 61:19, 62:4, 62:9, 64:25, 68:10, 70:14, 76:22, 82:8, 83:9, 90:5, 90:19, 116:13, 116:14 testifies [2] - 70:19, 93:9 testify [4] - 56:7, 68:4, 69:17, 91:24 testimony [28] - 18:3, 18:10, 19:3, 20:11, 20:21, 28:13, 29:24, 31:5, 33:25, 34:20, 52:13, 52:17, 61:16, 61:19, 71:12, 80:3,

81:20, 90:20, 93:1,

93:18, 115:5, 115:11, 115:17, 117:23, 118:3, 118:7, 118:15, 121:8 **TEXAS** [14] - 1:4, 1:5, 1:5, 1:11, 2:6, 2:12, 2:17, 2:18, 2:19, 3:4, 3:6, 3:16, 4:6, 130:1 **Texas** [27] - 1:20, 5:7, 5:8, 5:12, 5:13, 7:1, 7:10, 7:12, 8:3, 8:13, 8:14, 14:14, 20:2, 39:22, 42:13, 43:13, 49:14, 81:13, 89:10, 89:16, 108:15, 120:12, 130:5, 130:21, 130:23, 130:24 **THE** [87] - 1:4, 1:4, 2:3, 2:11, 2:17, 2:18, 3:4, 3:14, 5:3, 5:20, 6:5, 6:10, 6:13, 7:14, 7:19, 7:23, 8:21, 9:7, 9:11, 9:19, 35:2, 39:5, 39:15, 45:5, 45:10, 63:16, 63:19, 87:22, 97:25, 98:3, 98:8, 98:12, 99:14, 99:22, 100:9, 100:14, 102:18, 103:3, 104:8, 104:17, 104:24, 105:3, 105:10, 107:10, 109:19, 110:12, 110:15, 110:24, 111:9, 111:14, 111:18, 112:8, 122:20, 123:3, 123:7, 123:11, 123:14, 124:11, 124:14, 124:17, 124:23, 124:25, 125:4, 125:6, 125:11, 125:13, 125:16, 125:23, 126:7, 126:11, 126:13, 127:18, 128:1, 128:4, 128:7, 128:10, 128:13, 128:16, 128:19, 128:22, 128:25, 129:3, 129:6, 129:9, 129:12, 130:1 themselves [2] - 71:2, 95:1

theory [7] - 66:18,

75:14, 75:17, 75:21,

76:21, 84:15, 84:25

thereafter [2] - 30:22,

118:9

91:15

transparency [1] -

therefore [9] - 7:2, 8:5, 32:4, 37:17, 37:20, 38:15, 115:22, 126:24, 127:13 they've [1] - 46:24 thinking [2] - 68:16, 105:14 thinks [2] - 107:14, 107:15 third [5] - 9:20, 38:13, 54:9, 64:14, 71:1 thirds [1] - 18:23 Thomas [1] - 19:22 thorough [1] - 44:5 thoroughly [1] - 119:3 threat [3] - 33:18, 102:14, 127:5 three [7] - 12:25, 42:12, 42:20, 49:11, 76:11, 86:21, 128:4 **Three** [2] - 96:7, 126:24 throughout [1] - 39:24 tidal [1] - 81:9 tight [2] - 78:24, 78:25 timeline [4] - 14:17, 17:23, 19:8, 74:18 today [10] - 11:18, 19:13, 29:16, 30:16, 40:5, 46:15, 76:1, 78:8, 91:21, 92:8 together [3] - 11:12, 19:16, 19:18 took [3] - 22:19, 33:11, 116:4 top [2] - 66:16, 96:2 **Topic** [1] - 24:15 topics [1] - 91:16 **Total** [1] - 43:16 totally [1] - 109:2 touch [2] - 28:20, 119:7 TOWER [1] - 2:5 town [1] - 30:3 trace [1] - 84:10 transaction [2] -19:14, 24:16 transactions [1] -23:18 transcript [3] - 105:12, 106:21, 108:10 transcription [2] -1:22, 130:7 transcripts [1] - 52:15 transformed [1] -

transparent [1] -91:15 transport [1] - 18:21 transportation [1] -61:8 transported [2] -15:21, 18:21 travels [1] - 65:24 TRAVIS [1] - 2:5 treat [1] - 91:15 TRIAL [1] - 1:2 trial [21] - 1:18, 7:3, 7:5, 7:9, 7:13, 8:6, 8:7. 8:11. 8:15. 41:21, 45:16, 47:21, 52:13, 52:16, 70:20, 71:13, 75:12, 102:12, 106:7, 115:18, 122:9 trials [1] - 46:13 trickier [1] - 109:20 tried [1] - 78:6 true [5] - 35:21, 43:10, 49:13, 110:21, 130:6 truly [1] - 130:14 trust [2] - 121:13, 122:7 trusted [1] - 90:6 try [4] - 10:24, 43:12, 87:20, 94:5 trying [6] - 23:14, 49:8, 49:9, 50:20, 96:14, 109:16 TSUCHIYAMA [1] turn [2] - 97:15, 121:1 turned [1] - 10:15 Twelve [2] - 96:18, 127:15 twelve [1] - 129:6 two [29] - 12:22, 15:3, 15:6, 18:23, 42:12, 43:3, 49:15, 50:25, 51:2, 51:4, 51:8, 66:10, 66:24, 67:18, 68:7, 69:16, 69:17, 73:7, 74:21, 85:21, 94:23, 99:8, 102:12, 105:1, 105:11, 106:5, 123:25, 128:1 **Two** [4] - 96:1, 96:3, 96:6, 126:24 two-thirds [1] - 18:23 type [8] - 23:13, 24:10, 25:6, 26:2, 26:3, 114:20, 119:23

## U

**UAO**[1] - 98:16

ubiquitous [1] - 61:10 ultimate [2] - 34:5, 88:23 ultimately [1] - 76:6 unanimous [1] -126:11 unbelievable [1] -36:1 under [20] - 7:10, 8:12, 12:11, 16:18, 26:7, 28:6, 28:12, 31:2, 35:23, 52:8, 52:22, 57:17, 63:4, 89:10, 89:16, 102:3, 108:15, 117:13, 118:11, 119:6 underlying [1] - 21:24 undertaken [1] - 22:4 undertook [1] - 92:15 underwater [6] -22:21, 26:11, 87:13. 116:10, 116:12, 116:16 undisputed [5] -15:10, 17:10, 18:18, 22:21, 26:18 unfair [1] - 41:16 unfortunate [1] -114:20 unfortunately [1] -68:22 uniformly [1] - 122:15 Unilateral [1] - 105:23 unimportant [1] - 40:9 unique [1] - 82:1 United [2] - 43:18, 43:25 University [2] - 30:1, unrelated [1] - 123:25 **up** [41] - 11:20, 27:3, 27:14, 29:18, 35:20, 39:10, 39:16, 41:13, 43:3, 47:24, 49:11, 52:13, 56:19, 63:15, 66:13, 66:15, 67:4, 70:11, 75:17, 77:8, 80:24, 81:12, 87:19, 89:15, 97:14, 98:5, 98:7, 99:23, 100:9, 100:16, 106:8, 108:13, 115:9,

115:12, 116:6,

116:7, 117:1,

120:1, 121:7

upfront [1] - 40:1

useful [1] - 103:18

upstream [1] - 67:10

118:23, 119:17,

# various [2] - 21:19, 85:16 verdict [25] - 8:23, 11:5, 97:7, 120:5, 122:19, 122:24, 125:20, 126:1, 126:9, 126:11, 127:22, 127:24, 128:2, 128:5, 128:8, 128:11, 128:14, 128:17, 128:20, 128:23, 129:1, 129:4, 129:7, 129:11, 129:12 video [3] - 20:13, 22:12, 24:24 Video [1] - 23:19

value [2] - 85:7, 117:6

vanilla [1] - 110:4

Vietnam [1] - 114:19 VILLARREAL [1] -128:9 Villarreal [1] - 128:9

VINCE [1] - 2:11 Vince [3] - 114:8, 114:9, 114:14 violated [3] - 98:20, 101:4, 102:13

87:7, 108:19 violations [5] - 9:16, 27:1, 36:24, 38:4, 38:11

violation [3] - 85:23.

violence [1] - 37:7 violent [1] - 37:11 voice [3] - 120:6, 120:7, 121:13

**volume** [2] - 43:21, 130:9 **VOLUME** [2] - 1:1

volunteered [1] -114:18 vulnerable [1] - 29:8

# W

wait [1] - 52:2 walk [1] - 31:12 wall [1] - 79:24 wants [6] - 9:24, 41:3, 72:20, 103:7, 103:14, 125:21 warn [4] - 25:22, 27:15, 27:17, 32:25 warned [1] - 14:6 warning [4] - 27:13, 27:21, 28:3, 47:13 warranted [1] - 102:16 washed [5] - 27:19, 116:10, 116:19, 116:22, 118:6 WASHINGTON [1] -3:22 **WASTE** [4] - 1:10, 1:11, 3:4, 3:4 waste [82] - 13:18, 13:19, 13:20, 13:21, 14:13, 14:20, 15:9, 15:10, 15:14, 15:18, 15:21, 15:22, 15:25, 16:14, 16:16, 16:19, 16:21, 16:23, 17:1, 17:5, 20:2, 22:6, 22:7, 22:10, 28:4, 29:11, 29:15, 31:17, 32:4, 33:17, 33:19, 38:3, 38:9, 40:17, 41:8, 42:15, 48:4, 48:7, 49:22, 50:6, 51:16, 51:17, 51:18, 51:23, 51:25, 52:3, 52:4, 52:8, 54:3, 54:4, 54:19, 55:24, 56:14, 58:14, 59:13, 64:9, 75:15, 75:25, 76:12, 77:20, 77:23, 78:2, 78:3, 78:15, 78:19, 83:3, 86:3, 95:10, 95:19, 116:2, 116:8, 116:12, 116:13, 116:17, 116:25, 117:5, 117:9, 117:12, 126:17, 127:4, 127:6 Waste [11] - 5:7, 5:8, 5:12, 5:13, 6:25, 7:10, 8:3, 8:12, 46:23, 50:4 watched [1] - 115:17 watching [1] - 120:5 water [36] - 16:8, 26:14, 28:6, 28:12, 29:6, 29:15, 29:23, 30:6, 30:8, 30:9, 30:12, 30:13, 31:18, 55:8, 64:18, 75:15, 75:16, 76:20, 77:2, 78:9, 78:21, 79:9, 79:13, 79:24, 80:9, 80:24, 81:6, 82:6, 82:7, 82:19, 116:21, 117:14, 118:9, 126:18, 127:7

Water [2] - 28:24,

water-impervious [1]

watering [5] - 76:10,

43:16

- 118:9

77:20, 77:25, 78:3, 79:15 waters [10] - 12:13, 14:14, 17:25, 26:7, 26:17, 28:7, 28:17, 33:20, 81:9, 118:11 ways [4] - 68:5, 68:8, 68:12, 70:7 weeks [2] - 10:17, 26:12 weird [1] - 122:8 welcome [1] - 10:3 western [3] - 76:25, 77:21, 116:18 wet [3] - 29:7, 31:2 WHITE [1] - 128:24 White [1] - 128:24 whole [1] - 61:6 wholeheartedly [1] -115:2 wholly [1] - 102:11 Wildlife [5] - 42:13, 43:14, 67:21, 69:8, 69:14 WINN [1] - 3:17 WINSTON [1] - 4:5 wish [1] - 39:16 withdraw [2] - 123:4, 123:21 withdrawal [2] -123:15, 123:17 withdrawing [2] -123:5, 123:9 withdrawn [5] -123:22, 124:1, 124:6, 124:8, 124:9 witness [7] - 52:12, 53:4, 58:20, 58:21, 60:3, 71:12, 80:9 WITNESS [1] - 130:17 witnesses [11] -35:17, 62:4, 63:8, 64:7, 67:13, 68:2, 75:2, 85:24, 93:19, 93:20, 95:1 word [10] - 47:13, 62:20, 101:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:16, 109:8, 111:19, 113:25 words [7] - 47:10, 47:16, 51:17, 61:21, 90:13, 99:18, 104:12 works [3] - 77:15, 77:16, 80:3 world [2] - 46:12, 46:16 worthy [2] - 36:4 Wotring [15] - 10:9,

12:3, 39:5, 40:12,

40:15, 44:17, 69:18, 70:4, 98:1, 106:17, 113:4, 122:20, 123:3, 123:4, 125:16 **WOTRING** [32] - 2:4, 2:7, 6:3, 10:10, 10:12, 22:13, 24:25, 35:6, 98:2, 98:6, 98:13, 99:16, 99:25, 100:8, 100:15, 103:17, 104:15, 104:20, 105:1, 105:9, 105:11, 108:8, 110:8, 110:16, 111:5, 111:16, 113:5, 113:7, 123:5, 123:18, 125:17, 127:16 wrap [2] - 63:15, 87:19 write [1] - 117:6 writing [1] - 130:8 written [1] - 55:17 wrongly [3] - 49:12, 49:13, 50:20

# Υ

**y'all** [1] - 121:15 yards [1] - 73:11 year [1] - 15:15 years [27] - 26:12, 42:20, 43:7, 46:9, 48:4, 49:17, 50:5, 57:8, 60:8, 73:6, 74:21, 74:22, 81:14, 82:17, 82:18, 82:22, 83:6, 83:7, 85:22, 85:24, 87:8, 87:16, 95:16, 118:11 yesterday [2] - 10:14, 68:10 you-all [5] - 35:14, 39:1, 114:23, 120:11, 121:4

# Ζ

**zero** [1] - 82:12 **Zoch** [16] - 27:9, 43:2, 56:7, 57:10, 57:13, 77:5, 77:11, 77:15, 79:1, 79:13, 80:16, 81:7, 90:3, 90:13, 115:11, 116:13